THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXV AUGUST, 1937 No. 206

EDITORIAL

The great Duke of Wellington is said to have remarked that if he were planning *de novo* a model constitution he would select the British constitution exactly as it then was. It was a courageous statement, worthy of the hero of Waterloo. Of course it is easy to see now that he was grievously, fantastically, overwhelmingly mistaken. The British constitution, still very imperfect, has been enormously improved since the day when it was believed that the affairs of the Empire could be administered by a few gentlemen who did it, as Mr. Guedalla says, by living in Mayfair and talking to one another at Westminster. But it is also easy to see that all statements of that kind, made about anything and from any quarter, conservative or revolutionary, of the heterogeneous kingdom of conviction, must always be mistaken. A ready-made constitution would never work. It is foolish to suppose that everything in the garden is lovely. It is also foolish to suppose that you can create a perfectly lovely garden in five minutes. The illusion of the fool's paradise is foolish. The delusion of a child's paradise, to be produced out of a hat or by the waving of a wand, is childish.

These observations are suggested by reading *Men, Money and the Ministry* (Longmans, 1s.) several times. It is a book of anonymous authorship, but fathered in general by a long and distinguished list of names, clerical and lay. On the one hand it is not difficult to agree that "if you were given an assured income of seven and a quarter millions to spend annually in England on the advancement of God's rule, one would not devise the Church of England organization as it is." On the other hand, the concrete proposals rather suggest the eager mentality which votes with both hands for the resolution that "after the appointed day the next ensuing Calendar year shall be deemed to be the year one, and all things and all persons

shall be the opposite of what they shall hitherto have been." The type is one which the Editor admires, to which indeed emotionally he himself belongs, but it is a simple, childish type which needs to be educated. And the first lesson it has to learn is that in England at least you always have to go on from the point at which you now are.

It used to be supposed that the parochial system was invented and produced all at once by Archbishop Theodore. It is now known that it grew up gradually during many generations, and at the instance of persons in many parts of the country. The reason why it has lasted is because it grew. Such reform of it as has hitherto taken place has come about by degrees, and further reform will also be gradual. Moreover, it is not desirable that the reform should lead towards absolute economic uniformity. There is in the Civil Service a general scale, according to which work at a certain level of rank always earns the same pay, and every promotion earns a rise in pay. Our authors would like a uniform system, with no rises except such as can be described as allowances for expenses. The natural comments on this are (i.) that there is nothing wrong about a system containing the possibility of a rise in pay, which is a reasonable and not necessarily a worldly-minded method of indicating the fact that some jobs are more important than others; (ii.) that to camouflage the higher stipends by giving such allowances as would enable men "to travel without undue fatigue, to have the best tools for their work, to be able to buy books freely, to have competent secretarial help, to be given to hospitality, to do their work and have their holidays without having to concern themselves unduly with ways and means," as well as to cover fees and the furnishing and maintaining of their houses, would not really meet the difficulties that are alleged to be felt. It would not satisfy the complaints of those who grumble because one of the properties of the Church of England is a share in coal royalties.

The motive of the reformers is wholly admirable. They want to roll away a reproach, and to set harassed priests free for happy spiritual work. They want to enable the Church to offer counsel to the community in regard to economic affairs with clean hands. They want to have an ecclesiastical system which can be morally defended. Their main prescription is over-communistic to commend itself to the English people, and does not seem to deserve to be described as the only Christian method.

Here and there they are wasting breath, as when they say that over-large houses should be got rid of as soon as possible. Most of the occupiers of over-large houses and the diocesan Boards which are concerned with such matters have been trying for years to do that very thing. But the Church ought to be very grateful for the reminders which are contained in the book. Payment in the Church of England is indefensibly haphazard, and often scandalously low. When a system cannot be justified in the forensic sense, it must be justified in the factitive sense. That is to say, justice must be introduced into it. It would be a good thing to create a pool by scaling down at each new vacancy such posts as are demonstrably over-paid, and at the same time to open fresh doors for voluntary sacrifice. It would be a good thing if differences of pay (as long as they continue) were commensurate with, or had some relation to, the differences in importance of work. It would be a good thing if all the clergy were freed from financial anxiety. We may agree that "If the revenues could be redistributed more equitably and with a single eye to the service of God's purpose, there would ensue a great release of spiritual power."

But we cannot help thinking that it is impossible to abolish bourgeois standards altogether. Every person in a civilized country who has any work of a directing nature is (or should be) equipped with appliances and with the help of other persons to enable him (or her) to work efficiently. Even under strict Communism, if it ever existed anywhere, the holders of responsible public positions would have offices, clerks, furniture, books, motor-cars, and other things at their disposal. All that at once sets them in a bourgeois position. The priest's place of business is his house. That confuses the issue in the mind of the unthinking, but it is part of the situation. It is the simple fact that his work will be better done if there is someone other than himself or his wife to answer the bell and cook the dinner. That at once sets him among the bourgeois. It seems inevitable. It is unlucky that he should have such unpopularity as this may bring, and at the same time be in point of fact so poor that he can buy no books and take no holiday. That is where reform—a great deal of reform—is needed. It is also pitiful that circumstances tempt some ministers of the Gospel to be luxurious and others to be covetous. This is where both reform and regeneration are needed. But *Men, Money and the Ministry* is the eye-opener rather than the spectacles for constant wear, the shock rather than the remedy.

Stimulated by it, the Church Assembly will probably find some way of going on effectively and constructively from the point that has been reached so far.

There is one point which has not been faced in this brief handling of the matter. Ought the historic houses to be occupied by ecclesiastics? We can think of one which contains a mediæval hall and a chapel and numerous other rooms. It is expensive to maintain and the occupant spends all that he receives officially and a little more that he earns otherwise in meeting what either are or seem to him to be necessary calls. He has to deny himself some of the comforts which some of his friends seem able to procure, but he entertains, not so much as he would like, but to the limit of his capacity. His house is used very constantly for what may fairly be called pastoral purposes. For this a certain staff and certain appliances are essential. He is probably supposed by a number of his fellow-citizens to be putting by large sums every year. Is it worth while to use an old and beautiful house in this way? If not, what other course should be pursued? Another ecclesiastic, who is single, has an historic house. When he has visitors, he caters for them in the manner which he supposes that they will probably expect. When he is alone, he lives very frugally indeed. But in order to have visitors from time to time, he must maintain furniture and domestic staff. In order to prevent his old house from falling down, he must keep it in repair. He could not do this if his income were not fairly large. Is it worth while? How much would be gained or lost for the cause of God if he lived in a cottage and the house were either secularized or maintained by the Church for some public or institutional purpose? Is it worth while? A third ecclesiastic is obliged to forgo almost entirely the entertaining at which he would excel, because his whole stipend and some extra earnings and some private means are consumed by the necessity of maintaining a family in a large house. All three are probably considered by many to be overpaid and luxurious. In point of fact all three have their financial problems, and one at least has constant financial anxiety of a harassing kind.

To take one more example of a more general sort, is it worth while that the ancient Universities shall be maintained as they are? They are expensive, but most people consider that the graciousness of an old College court, with chapel, library, hall, kitchen, buttery, Master's Lodge, and students' chambers planted round it, is so satisfying, so educational, so constructive

that it is worth keeping. But always the expensive things are only worth keeping if the people who profit by them work for their living. A Dean living in a Deanery is an expensive article. Is he worth keeping? We suggest that, if he works hard, the gain of him on the whole outweighs the loss.

The death of Edwyn Clement Hoskyns is a grievous loss to the Church and to theology. He was a pioneer Christian scholar, and it is probable that his best work was still to come. As a young man, though full of charm, he did not, so far as we know, give promise of the massive capacity that he has since shewn. His academic record in youth was not specially distinguished, and when he came back, full of new ideas, after a period of study in Germany, an old priest in the diocese of Southwell spoke of him once, half admiringly, half disparagingly, as "a clever little monkey." But Corpus, like Oriel with Newman, according to the testimony of Whately, "made no mistake" when they appointed him Fellow. He soon became one of the most learned and stimulating teachers of theology in the University. His lectures were good, but it was as a teacher of pupils that he excelled. He was soon known outside Cambridge. His contribution ("Jesus the Messiah") to *Mysterium Christi* in 1930 made it clear that he had something of importance to say about the New Testament. It was remarked at the time in the *Guardian* that "it indicates a way of approach to the whole problem of New Testament Christology which the author will have to develop at greater length elsewhere. It is an important essay, too closely packed to be read easily."

The fuller treatment came with *The Riddle of the New Testament*, by himself and Mr. Noel Davey, in 1931. It was a new view, expressed with eagerness and power, and it dealt the final death-blow to the old Liberal Protestant view, which had for some time been *in extremis*. The thesis was to the effect that every strand of the Gospels, examined critically, proves to contain, in itself, not imposed upon it by writer or editor, but as an integral part of its own fabric, the picture of our Lord as a Messianic, supernatural, prophecy-fulfilling Figure. There was perhaps some exaggeration in the book. Every occurrence in a Gospel passage of a word which also occurred in an Old Testament prophetic passage was hailed as an evidence of intention. But in the main it was convincing. There appeared from the critical examination a picture of our Lord which was not at all the conventional humanitarian portrait, but something much more startling and tremendous, a revelation of God, "as much a scandal to the first century as

it is to the twentieth." And yet it was " so desperately human that there emerged within the early Church a faith in men and women so deeply rooted as to make modern humanitarianism seem doctrinaire and trivial." The upshot of the historical scrutiny was not to inflict any conclusions on the readers. It was in effect to say, " We have examined the evidence. Here is the stark, uncompromising result of our enquiry. We lay it before you. We are historians. We are not, or at least we are not at this stage, theologians or preachers. It is for you to draw the conclusion for yourselves. It is for you to say whether or not you will bow your heads to the Master Who confronts you with His inexorable challenge."

There is plainly in this a rich measure of Barthianism, and it was accordingly not surprising when in 1933 Hoskyns translated Barth's colossal Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. It was a very difficult and very successful piece of translation. He had also begun to do a great work for national education. An active member of the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board for Examinations, he was intensely interested in promoting the intelligent study of the Bible in Public Schools. The Bible was in his view one of the essential subjects of serious study. He worked hard to get it taken seriously in schools, and he was impatient with those headmasters who, often with the best motives, considered that it was not a suitable subject for examination. It is believed that the Board of Education had begun to take advantage of his enthusiasm and his ideas. One lighter reminiscence may perhaps be added. It somehow leaked out that at one meeting of the Cambridge Syndicate for selecting University preachers, Dr. X. pleaded that Free Church divines should be among those invited. This has since been done, but it was not at that time constitutional. Dr. X. was eloquent. The University pulpit should be free as air, with no restrictions, open to Christian scholars and theologians of all denominations. The Chairman was sympathetic, but explained that the Syndicate had no power to invite other than clergymen of the Church of England. A quarter of an hour later it was Hoskyns' turn to propose a name. He suggested the Reverend M. C. D'Arcy. Dr. X. rose to it. He exclaimed, " But he is a Roman Catholic !" Then, catching a mischievous gleam in Hoskyns' eye, he subsided in confusion. Clement Hoskyns had infinite charm, and if he sometimes rode his theological horse over-hard, it was a brave steed, and both it and its rider were utterly consecrated to the service of the Lord and of His Church. R.I.P.

We shall print next month an admirable appreciation of Clement Hoskyns by a friend and ex-pupil, the Rev. Charles Smyth. It reached us just too late to be included in the present number.

The Rev. E. Milner-White's article on the 1928 Revision of the Prayer Book is the first of a series which will appear from time to time. We believe that they will be of real service when the moment comes for future revision by authority. There are few who combine better those varieties of sense which are called devotional, liturgical, and common.

The Editor had the arduous duty, from July 12 to 26, of attending the Oxford Conference on Life and Work ("Church, Community and State") as one of eighteen delegates of the Church of England. The value of the Conference for the Church and for the public will lie chiefly in the Reports of the Sections, which will presently be printed. But some general remarks, particularly on the contribution which Orthodox and Anglicans may be expected to make at any future such Conference, will appear in the next number. The representatives of Orthodoxy and Anglicanism have been treated with the utmost consideration, but they can hardly be said to have had an opportunity of exhibiting all the traditions which they have inherited.

THE 1928 REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK

I. An Introduction to Morning or Evening Prayer

Constructive criticism of the 1927-28 Prayer Book may have its value. For one day, that revision will give place to another, more widely agreed and in places better wrought. Over its more controversial issues much will be said by many people; but there is a danger that the changes which arouse no passion may not receive that close scrutiny which would improve their detail and maintain the extraordinary standards of dignity and rhythm set by the book's predecessors. After ten years, it is possible to speak from the experience of use.

Here we would deal merely with "An Introduction to Morning or Evening Prayer."

Little enough controversy is called out by a section consisting of Sentences, Exhortation, General Confession and Absolution. Good liturgiologists are pained by the change of the function of the Sentences. In the old Book these were the penitential beginning of a penitential office of Preparation. In the 1928 Book they have become something in the nature of an introit for the whole Daily Office which follows, chosen on account of their suitability for the seasons of the Church's year. "This disregard of the purpose of the Sentences breaks the unity of the introduction. The function of the new Sentences would have been better performed by invitatories." Dr. Ratcliffe's criticism (in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 271) is in theory right. But since the Preparation, if used at all, is in fact always followed by Morning and Evening Prayer, the loss of liturgical unity is not observable in practice, because the seasonal Sentence only expresses the mood in which each member of the congregation is approaching the Office as a whole.

Thus experience finds little to object to in this new system of opening the Daily Office, and something to say in its favour. Invitatories within the Office proper are found difficult of insertion on congregational and musical grounds. But if we are to accept the standpoint of the Revision here, the Sentences themselves must be revised and added to. Some of the new Sentences err on the side of length (*e.g.*, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, All Saints). An opening Sentence should as a rule be brief, say, not more than thirty words; Compline provides a good model in "The Lord Almighty grant us a quiet night and a perfect end." It is possible to repeat the Easter Sentence on one or two special days; it becomes intolerable if used on every week-day in Eastertide. Again, if the Sentences are to

be thus used, they must be increased in number to cover all ordinary needs. For instance: the Sentence, "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance; the memory of the just is blessed," is inappropriate for use on Lady Days, and inadequate to cover the numerous types of Saint; something more pertinent, surely, could be found for Feasts of Apostles.

The rescension below makes considerable additions, but none which have not been found necessary or desirable in actual use. It has followed the mind of the revisers in keeping only to scriptural quotations. A no less attractive set could be formed from non-scriptural sources, from the invitatories and antiphons of the old service-books.

Little need be said about the Exhortations. It seems a pity not to recognize the customary and dignified abbreviation of "Dearly beloved brethren," which moves straight from this address to "I pray and beseech you . . ." The new Exhortation is one of the best-wrought newcomers to the Prayer Book.

Just as the new General Confession is the worst. "An undistinguished composition" is the verdict of *Liturgy and Worship*. As a mission service or in a side chapel it may be possible to use it; in the large church it is impossible and lacks all dignity. We have cut it out and ventured upon a new one, aided by some expressions of Henry Vaughan the Silurist in his devotional work, *The Mount of Olives*, 1652. But there is always available the more general form which is given later in Compline, of proven excellence.

Two other changes we would make. The first, one of order. The "Introduction" as it stood in the 1662 Book had become by 1914 one of the few devotions familiar to the whole Church, even to the whole country. It thus played, however odd it may seem, a most valuable part during the war. When books were as scarce as churches, every soldier knew at least the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer! In the writer's judgment, there is a strong case for keeping the old order together, and appointing the new to be used as a whole at will; not permitting any member of old and new to be used together indiscriminately. The worth of the new alternative could thus be more clearly proved or estimated.

The second change is the addition of a prayer for pardon to be used in place of the absolution, when the service is read by a Deacon or Lay-reader. This so constantly happens that it requires provision. The obvious recourse is to the Collect for Trinity XXI. But when a real opportunity for enrichment presents itself, it is a pity to lose it. The sixteenth-century prayer, "Lord, for thy tender mercies' sake," well known as the words of an anthem by Hilton (1569-1657), is

of exceeding loveliness and exactly apt. It has only to be known and used to be loved. To make it thus available were definite gain both to Church and Prayer Book.

Here then follows a suggested revision of the Revision in this section:

¶ *The Minister shall read with a loud voice some one or more of the Sentences of the Scriptures that follows :*

Of Penitence.

I will arise and go to my Father . . . (1928.)
If we say that we have no sin . . . (1928.)
To the Lord our God belong mercies . . . (1928.)
Enter not into judgment . . . (1928.)

Of Approach.

Seek ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near. (Isaiah lv. 6.)

Thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer from everlasting is thy name. (Isaiah lxiii. 16).

Jesus saith, I am the way, the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. (John xiv. 6.)

Of Worship.

God is a Spirit . . . (1928.)
O worship the Lord . . . (1928.)

Morning.

O Lord, be gracious unto us; we have waited for thee: be thou our arm every morning and our salvation. (Isaiah xxxiii. 2.)

Evening.

Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as an evening sacrifice. (Psalm cxli. 2.)

Advent.

Repent ye: for . . . (1928.)
The night is far spent . . . (1928.)

Behold he cometh, the desire of nations; and the house of the Lord shall be filled with glory. (Haggai ii. 7, *Ancient Antiphon.*)

Christmas.

Behold, I bring you . . . (1928.)

Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder. (Isaiah ix. 6.)

Epiphany.

Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. (Isaiah lx. 1.)

The Lord declared his salvation . . . (1928.)

Herein was the love of God manifested . . . (1928, transferred from Christmas.)

Septuagesima.

O praise God in his holiness; praise him in the firmament of his power. (Psalm cl. 1.)

Sexagesima.

The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. (Isaiah lx. 19.)

Quinquagesima.

Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation of our sins. (1 John iv. 10.)

Lent.

Rend your hearts . . . (1928.)

The sacrifices of God . . . (1928.)

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. (Isaiah ciii. 6.)

Passiontide.

Is it nothing to you . . . (1928.)

Christ the Lord became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross (Philippians ii. 8.)

Maundy Thursday.

I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. (John vi. 51.)

Good Friday.

God commendeth . . . (1928.)

Easter Even.

Rest in the Lord . . . (1928.)

Easter.

Blessed be the God . . . (1928.)

This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. (Psalm cxviii. 24.)

Christ is risen from the dead; and become the firstfruits of them that slept. (1 Corinthians xv. 20.)

Ascension.

Seeing that we have . . . (1928.)

God is gone up with a merry noise; and the Lord with the sound of the trump. (Psalm xlvii. 5.)

Whitsunday.

The love of God . . . (1928.)

Trinity.

I will love thee, O Lord, my strength; my Saviour, my God and my might, in whom I will trust. (Psalm xviii. 1.)

God is love . . . (1928.).

All Saints' Day.

Seeing we are compassed . . . (1928.)

Festivals of B.V.M.

And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word. (Luke i. 38.)

Feasts of Apostles.

Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory. (John xvii. 24.)

Saints' Days.

The righteous shall be had . . . (1928.)

Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things. (Matthew xxv. 21.)

These are they which have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb: therefore are they before the throne of God. (Revelation vii. 14.)

The New Year or any Anniversary.

They that wait upon the Lord . . . (1928.)

Dedication.

Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. (1 Corinthians iii. 11.)

Harvest.

The earth is the Lord's . . . (1928.)

Thanksgiving.

Praise the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me praise his holy name. Praise the Lord, O my soul; and forget not all his benefits. (Psalm ciii. 1, 2.)

Time of Trouble.

God is our hope and strength . . . (1928.)

National.

Salvation belongeth unto the Lord; thy blessing be upon thy people. (Psalm iii. 8.)

King's Accession and Birthday.

The King shall rejoice in thy strength, O Lord; his honour is great in thy salvation. (Psalm xxi. 1 and 5.)

¶ *The Minister, turning to the people, shall say the Exhortation in the form following:*

Dearly beloved brethren . . . saying after me;

¶ *And this form of Exhortation shall always be said on Advent Sunday and the First Sunday in Lent: at other times the words from "the Scripture moveth. . . . Wherefore" may be omitted; or the Minister may say,*

Let us humbly confess our sins to Almighty God.

¶ *Then shall follow the General Confession, to be said of the whole congregation after the Minister, all kneeling.*

Almighty and most merciful Father . . . Amen.

¶ *The Absolution or Remission of Sins, to be pronounced by the Priest alone, standing : the people still kneeling.*

Almighty God, the Father . . . *Amen.*

¶ *Or, except on Advent Sunday and the First Sunday in Lent, this form may be used :*

Beloved, we are come together . . . with us now. (1928.)

Then after a space for silence, this General Confession shall be said together, all kneeling :

Most gracious Almighty God, full of lovingkindness and longsuffering, we confess unto thee, we confess with our whole heart, our neglect and forgetfulness of thy commandments, our wrong doing, speaking and thinking, the hurts we have done to others, and the good we have left undone; O Lord, blot out, we beseech thee, the transgressions that are against us, for thy goodness and thy glory, and for the sake of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

¶ *The Absolution, to be pronounced by the Priest alone : the people still kneeling.*

May the Almighty and merciful Lord grant unto you pardon and remission of all your sins, time for true repentance and amendment of life, and the grace and comfort of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

¶ *If there be no Priest present, the prayer following shall be said by the minister, kneeling :*

Lord, for thy tender mercies' sake, lay not our sins to our charge, but forgive that is past, and give us grace to amend our lives; to decline from sin and incline to virtue, that we may walk with a perfect heart before thee, now and evermore. Amen.

E. Milner-White.

THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD: AN INTERPRETATION

Some time ago Dr. Alington, in one of his articles to the daily press, alluded to the difficulties presented by the interpretation of this parable. He had no constructive contribution to offer, but suggested that our Lord might have been misreported. He seemed, in fact, to abandon the hope of a satisfactory interpretation. This article is written in the hope not merely of putting forward a convincing interpretation—this was done by Dr. Eagar in an article in the *Expositor* for December, 1895—but of relating it to its historical background and thus reinforcing Dr. Eagar's interpretation, with some modifications of it.

Let me begin by setting down the parable as it is given in the Gospel for the Ninth Sunday after Trinity in the Book of Common Prayer, and in that for the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost in the Roman Missal. It will be seen that both leave off at the same place, a fact which has probably not been without its influence upon the interpretation of the parable, which really requires the verses which follow in St. Luke, but are not included in either liturgical gospel.

St. Luke xvi. : " There was a certain rich man which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee ? Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do ? for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig, to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called everyone of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord ? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou ? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, take thy bill, and write fourscore. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations " (τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς).

Here the liturgical gospel ends. But St. Luke continues:

" He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches ? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own ?" (Luke xvi. 10-12).

The bearing of these verses upon the parable is surely obvious. The steward in first wasting his master's goods and then using his position to ingratiate himself at his master's expense with his debtors is surely guilty of the unfaithfulness in the matter of unrighteous mammon, in " that which is another's " which our Lord so pointedly condemns.

What then are we to make of the words: " the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely; for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light "? And again of our Lord's words: " And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations " (σκηνάς) ? If these words are made to contain the real point of his parable, as has often been the case, and to inculcate a wisdom, like that of worldlings, in the use of money, only for spiritual ends, then they rather seem to conflict with verses 10-12, which urge faithfulness in the use of another's wealth, rather than discretion in the use of money whether of one's own or held in trust. Nor does any interpretation of them, which makes them the real point of the parable, get rid of this difficulty. Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*, a book which enjoyed a considerable vogue some forty or more years back, shewing how our Lord was continuously engaged during His ministry in training His Apostles, gives an interpretation which is certainly ingenious, but hardly convincing. He points out that the parable is addressed to His disciples. " And," he adds, " as the disciples had no worldly goods at all, it cannot be the main drift of the parable, as has been sometimes maintained, to inculcate Christian prudence in the use of these." He suspects that " the key to the main purport " lies in what he calls " the closing comment," viz., the words which declare that " the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light." And he continues, " The drift of the parable is, indeed, to teach a kind of prudence, but not one in which *money* is concerned. The administration of property is only the vehicle in which the lesson is conveyed. What I take to be inculcated here is true Christian wisdom as to the exercise of authority—spiritual authority above all. The moral that I discern is this: that the Apostles and their successors may do more good by shewing a little indulgence—by conceding

something to weak human nature, not enforcing Jewish formalities, and not insisting too inflexibly upon every point which they think may touch the honour or the privileges of Christ's Church—than by adhering to the strictest regard for observances, and imposing rules for sanctity of thought and conduct with which only a chosen few would be able to comply." The parable is, in fact, a warning against rigorism on the part of the clergy.

Quite apart from the fact that such an interpretation seems forced, and in conflict with the simplicity which marks our Lord's discourses generally and His parables in particular, it ignores the fact that the " closing comment " is to be found in the injunction of verses 9-12, which is not to a prudent discretion in the use of property held in trust, but to *faithfulness*.

Let us turn now to Dr. Eagar's interpretation. He points out that the moral of the parable is plainly the injunction to faithfulness which follows it, faithfulness in the use of " unrighteous mammon," in " that which is another's." The words " the Lord commanded the unjust steward," etc., as also the following words of our Lord, " And I say unto you," etc., he treats as " sarcasm pure and simple." The steward, he insists, showed no " wisdom " in imagining that his Lord's debtor would be likely to employ him in a position of trust because he had abused such a position in their favour. And he makes a special point in this connection of the words τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. " We can hardly avoid noticing this peculiar phrase—' the everlasting tents.' A tent is by its very nature transitory, and the true interpretation of the parable must take account of this remarkable expression."

This particular point in Dr. Eagar's interpretation impressed me when I first read it. But I have become increasingly distrustful of it in recent years. For I have seen the pitfalls to which this kind of philological argument is exposed.

I have seen, for instance, doubtful theological speculations erected on the word ἐκενώσεν, translated literally but certainly not accurately, " he emptied." And I am far from satisfied that, in the κοινη in which St. Luke wrote, the word σκηναί conveyed its original meaning of " tents," any more than, in the vocabulary of St. Paul, κένος conveys its original meaning of " empty."* It is likely, I think, that it had the general derivative meaning of " abodes." Nor does αἰωνίος mean " everlasting," so much as " belonging to the eternal order."

* In the words of St. John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, we have the verb based upon the noun σκήνη. Yet the translation " dwelt among us " fairly represents the meaning. If the original meaning of σκήνη as a tent and therefore transitory were here insisted upon, one might see a revived Docetism resting, like much Kenotism, on a philological basis.

And in any case our Lord spoke the parable originally in Aramaic, and it is in that language that we should expect to find any such nuance as Dr. Eagar insists upon. Yet, with some reservations of this kind, I am convinced that Dr. Eagar's argument does point to the right interpretation of the parable. I prefer to say that the words which he describes as " sarcasm, pure and simple " are ironic in character.

And a much more recent writer has confirmed me in this belief. Dr. Torrey, Professor of Semitic languages at Yale University, in *The Four Gospels*, published little more than a year ago by Hodder and Stoughton, maintained that the Gospels were originally written in Aramaic, and later translated into Greek. Whether this theory, which he advances with great confidence, be finally established or not matters little to the question we are now considering. For this parable was certainly spoken originally in Aramaic, and translated into Greek, either by St. Luke himself or, quite probably, by another before him. A consideration of the original Aramaic is of great importance to the vexed question of interpretation. Dr. Torrey is probably the greatest living authority on Palestinian Aramaic, and his translation of this parable is based on his conjecture, from the translation in Greek, of the original Aramaic. He translates the crucial verses 8 and 9 as follows:

" Did the lord of the estate praise his faithless manager because he had acted shrewdly (for the sons of this world are more sagacious than the sons of light, in the dealings with their fellowmen) ? and do I say unto you, gain friends for yourselves with base lucre, so that when it is gone, you may be received into the eternal abodes ? He who is faithful with little is faithful also with much, and he who is unfaithful with little is unfaithful also with much. If then you have not been trustworthy with the false riches, who will entrust you with the true ? And if you have not been faithful with the possessions of others, who will give you your own ?"

And his note on this translation is as follows: " The Aramaic interrogation ordinarily has no interrogative particle; the interpretation rests with the reader. A translator naturally makes every sentence declarative, unless the need of a question is made obvious by the immediate context, which here is not the case. . . . The irony was not seen."

For our Lord's immediate hearers, His true meaning would be conveyed by the inflection with which He spoke His words, rather than by the bare words spoken.

Dr. Torrey then presents, in a more convincing form, Dr. Eagar's theory of what he called " sarcasm," and what I prefer, with Dr. Torrey, to call " irony."

It may be freely granted that such irony is exceptional in our Lord's discourses. So is "scorn." Yet He called Herod "that fox." May it not be that special circumstances dictated this irony, shewing a depth of feeling in His sensitive soul?

This brings me to a further point in the consideration of the parable and its interpretation. Surely it is obvious that, as a parable of stewardship, it was particularly concerned with the Apostles, who were to be the stewards of God's household.

In this same Gospel of St. Luke we read how after our Lord had told a parable of servants who were to be found waiting and watching for their Master, St. Peter asked: "Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even unto all?" (St. Luke xii. 41). And our Lord replied: "Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of need in due season?" (v. 42). Plainly our Lord's answer implies that He is speaking with special reference to the Apostles, who were to occupy a position of special privilege and special responsibility in His Church. After this answer, a parable dealing with stewardship must be held to have a special reference to the Apostles. Are there any circumstances in the history of the Apostles which will provide a background to the parable and an explanation of its moving irony? Surely there are. "The disciples had no worldly goods at all," wrote Mr. Latham. But they, with their Master, depended on a common fund. And of that fund one of their number was treasurer. And this Apostle proved, as we know, unfaithful to the trust reposed in him. "He was a thief," says St. John. Not only that, but, like the steward in the parable, he sought to ingratiate himself with our Lord's enemies, when he betrayed Him for thirty pieces of silver.

Towards the end—and this parable belongs to our Lord's final teachings—the mind of Jesus dwells much upon the treachery of Judas. What is more likely than that this parable should have been in the nature of a final appeal to the Apostle who had already proved unfaithful in the use of the money entrusted to his keeping and who was in the end to betray his Master to His enemies? If this were so, with what pointedness it invests our Lord's ironic words, whether in the form of question or statement, about making friends of the mammon of unrighteousness who might provide for the steward who had failed and lost his privileges. What freshness of meaning it gives to the words: "If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is

another's, who will give you that which is your own?" Regarded as a warning, stern and sorrowful, but with the emotion which expresses itself in an unaccustomed irony, the parable is seen to fit with a marvellous exactness events which we know to have occurred.

A word may perhaps be added in conclusion. Those who believe in the divine inspiration of holy scripture will see divine guidance in the selection made by the Evangelists from our Lord's many discourses and parables. Divine wisdom selects this parable, among others, to be passed on to successive generations of Christians. And may not the reason be that the special warning addressed to Judas Iscariot has proved to be needed again and again by the clergy of the Christian Church? No sin, perhaps, on the part of prelates and priests has called for such frequent denunciation, and even legislation for its control, as the sin of simony. And simony is precisely the sin of unfaithfulness in regard to the money provided in the Christian Church for the support of the ministry and the sustenance of their work for souls. The injunction to faithfulness in the use of money has never been, and is never likely to be, without point in the Church militant here on earth.

A. H. Baverstock.

"THE PERTINENCY OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH TODAY"*

Discussion of any theological matter had best begin with a definition of terms. Such definition is useful in any reasoning together; but it is particularly necessary in our present venture, a discussion of the relevancy of the Christian faith; and that because almost no one nowadays seems sure of what the term "Christian" may mean, while there is no term more apt to be misunderstood, by those who casually approach the study of religion, than is "the faith." Let us, then, define. Possibly, as in many a consideration, the question of the pertinency of the Christian faith in the modern world may be well on the way to solution if we understand what it is that we are talking about.

I

What is meant by "a faith"? We are to speak of "*the* faith," rather than of "faith" *per se*; but the two things cannot

* A paper read before a conference of University people at the Synod Hall, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York City, November 3, 1936.

be separated. A faith is a body of truth, or alleged truth, about God, derived from a long and co-operative using of the human reason, by generations of devotees, to arrange in order certain discoveries they have made through the exercise of "faith." A religious faith is not a body of theoretical propositions to which one is invited to give intellectual assent. Neither the Christian religion nor any other religion that has a prevailing power consists, or ever has consisted, of a set of opinions. Religion is not primarily something about which to debate; but rather a technic of personal companionship between God and human beings.

It is significant that in the entire New Testament there is no word for "the faith," in the sense of a set of theological propositions; but "faith," in the sense of a personal attitude of venturesome confidence in a person (πίστις), is used 261 times. Similarly, the word "belief" is used only once in the New Testament, and there, in the Greek, the word again is πίστις, which means literally "trust," and not at all a something to be agreed with or denied. And even so it is with the verb "to believe." There are two Greek words for "believe": one, νομίζω, means "to give intellectual assent" to some*thing*, while the other, πιστεύω, means "to put one's personal trust" in some*body*. The former is *never* translated "believe" in our English Bible; "believe," in our Gospels and the rest, is a translation of the latter. In the vocabulary of the Christian religion, "to believe," then, *always* means "to put one's trust in" someone.

It is so, also, in a good deal other of our common speech. When a man says, "I believe in my wife," he does not mean that he gives intellectual assent to the proposition that he has a wife; rather, he means that he has entire confidence in her as a wifely person. Exactly that is meant not only by the New Testament Greek word used for a religious believing, but also by the Latin word for it, *credo*. Used transitively, with the accusative, *credo* means to "commit something in trust" to somebody intransitively; with the dative, it means "to have reliance on" somebody. Either way it implies confidence in a person, not assent to a proposition.

That is exactly the sense that *Belief* or *Faith* has in the Christian terminology. The Christian never says, in his *Credo*: "I give assent to the fact of God the Father," or "I agree that there is an Only-Begotten Son that became incarnate," or "I concede the existence of God the Holy Ghost," or "I admit that there is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." What he does proclaim, along with his brethren, is rather this: "I put my confidence in God the Father," and "I have implicit trust in

Jesus Christ His Son, the Lord," and "I give myself unreservedly into the hands of God the Holy Ghost," and "I risk my life for the sake of that mighty band of brethren, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church."

I have devoted some time to iteration of this point, because I am quite certain that no one with a clear head on him is going to see the relevancy of the faith to anything at all as long as he regards the faith as a set of theoretical propositions, to be perhaps conceded, instead of as a series of personal entrustments.

A religious faith, then, is not primarily a matter of philosophy, but of experience. When undergraduates have come to me, as often they have, and said that they received no help, in the solution of religious difficulties, from professors in the philosophy department, but rather a greater befuddlement, I have always replied, "What did you expect? A philosopher is the *last* man you ought to think of consulting for guidance in religion." And then I have always added, "Do not misunderstand me. You can go to the philosopher, and you must go; but *last*, not first. Just as you cannot have a philosophy of science unless you first know science as an experience; just as you cannot have a philosophy that analyzes beauty with any competence until first you know beauty as something pursued and found; even so you cannot have a philosophy of religion until you have experienced religion, or at the very least know that it is something which others have experienced, and do experience." The faith, be it repeated, is not primarily a matter of philosophy. It is a formulation of what has been discovered by way of faith, by way of confidence in God and entrustment of mind and soul to God.

If one says that man does not discover truth in any such way as that, then to that one the faith has, and can have, no pertinency whatever. That point ought to be faced honestly, and cheerfully admitted. To him who thinks that the only truth is scientific truth, truth discovered by measuring concrete things and forces, religion is necessarily nonsense, since the nature of God is not discernible in terms of matter or energy. The being of God may, indeed, be inferred from those laws of nature which have been scientifically ascertained. In fact, most reputable scientists that I have met say that the existence of God is easier to credit, in view of scientific order, than His non-existence. But religion, by definition (in the Oxford Dictionary, for instance), is not merely a recognition of some higher unseen power as having control of man's destiny, but also an acknowledgment of Him as entitled to human obedience, reverence and worship; and it involves such a general mental and moral reaction as results from such acknowledgment of

Divine suzerainty over man's life. Religion involves an attitude of love to God, or dread of Him, or both of these at once; it requires not merely a theorizing about God, or even a cataloguing of facts about Him, but also a personally knowing Him.

We do not know *any* persons, human or divine, by science only. Knowing my lover is not a matter of weighing him or her, measuring, classifying; there is also much more, a super-scientific element, a mystic element, involved in such knowing. But it is real knowledge that I get about my lover in that extra-scientific way, knowledge more intimate and valuable by far than any knowledge that science can reveal. I get to know my lover by experience of that lover, an experience possible only by faith in that lover, by virtue of which I commit myself. Similarly I get to know the Supreme Person, whose mind outbreathes and thus creatively sustains the universe, only by loving Him; and such loving and knowing of Him can come only by faith—not by my saying to Him only: "I accept the proposition that Thou art," but rather "I put my trust in Thee."

But knowledge that results from such entrustment is *not a merely individual matter*, any more than æsthetics is a matter of what an individual happens to think pretty, or science a matter of what one single laboratory experimenter thinks true. The experience of one scientific man, or of one generation of scientists, is added to the great body of scientific knowledge, past and present, enriching it, augmenting it, sometimes correcting it and at length sure to be corrected by it, but only a part of it; and thus *mutually* there are discovered the scientific laws. Each man's experience of beauty, or that of a single generation or epoch, is, similarly, added to the great body of such experience of beauty, past and present, augmenting it, enriching it, sometimes correcting it and in the end certain to be corrected by it, but only a part of it; and thus *mutually* there are discovered the principles of æsthetics. And so, as well, each man's experience of God, or that of one period of history or of those living in terms of one culture, is added to the great body of such experience past and present, augmenting it, enriching it, sometimes correcting it and at last inevitably corrected by it, but only a part of it; and so emerges *mutually* our knowledge of the necessary laws of commerce with the Infinite. Man has experienced that-which-is in terms of objective fact, and thence comes Science; experienced that-which-is in terms of beauty, and thence arise the Arts; experienced that-which-is in terms of personality, and thence comes Religion.

All these are experiences of an objective reality; all of them —Science, the Arts, Religion. And by all of them comes knowledge, true knowledge. None of them is an activity introspective in character. Introspection is the enemy of knowledge and the destroyer of sanity. The oracle that once said "Know thyself" was controlled by dæmons of an insane genius. An introspective Science is a contradiction in terms. So is an introspective Art. So is an introspective Religion. If I would know, I must forget myself and pursue the Other-than-I. That is true of all the paths to knowing; of all of them—Science, the Arts, Religion.

A sound faith, then, is not so much *my* faith as *the* faith, the technic of a confidence discovered by the race, that knowledge of Him Who is to be trusted which has seemed to the myriads adequately to reveal Him that is to be longed for, searched for, found. A "personal creed" is like an individualistic statement of scientific law or an individualistic formulation of æsthetic law—amusing, but of no importance to speak of. It is *the* faith, the group-tested, age-tested faith, that alone has much of any relevance; the formulation of that searching out of God by human seekers, since time was, by which haply they might find Him and be found. If I can master such an adequate method as such a faith involves and reveals, I can go to work on the basis of it, confident that I shall get somewhere and learn something.

There must be *authority*, then, behind a creed, the authority of past experience; and we must learn to submit ourselves to that authority, to the authority of them gone before us in life's spiritual laboratory. Else there will be no learning by us of anything much that is of God.

There are those who find such submission intolerable; but such an attitude is more than a little ridiculous in any field of learning.

Imagine a young woman, deciding to study chemistry, but scornfully, or perhaps only serenely, ignoring all that former chemists have discovered. She would come to nothing in chemistry. She might come to worse than nothing, and blow herself to bits. She might, just possibly, light on one or two tiny truths, but even those she would never understand, because they would remain unrelated to other truths that she knew nothing of but which her fathers in the science knew. Chemistry students are not such fools as to despise tradition. They accept, on authority, an immense amount of authoritative dogmatic teaching (literally dogmatic, for the word "dogma" means only "that which is generally agreed upon"). Our young chemist accepts, then, chemical dogma, and goes herself

to work, assuming that what she is dogmatically told is indeed the truth. She then learns the chemical technique, by way of long, hard practice. She may, all her life long, discover not one new thing, but at least she is happy to find that, for her as for others, certain things are indeed so. She makes those tested truths her own, and is thereby a wiser woman. It may be that she does uncover some single bit of truth never before perceived, and adds it to the dogma of the science, having persuaded others to test the validity of what she thinks is her discovery. It may be that of some small matter she proves that the chemists who have preceded her did not quite understand it, shews them a modifying fact or two that they had not yet perceived. But even then she is most courteous to the chemical tradition, knowing that, in vastly the greater part, it is much more likely to be right than she or any other single experimenter.

Or imagine a young man who decides to be a painter, but has no patience with tradition. He will not learn the laws of perspective or of chiaroscuro, or any laws at all; but, like a savage, he will splash his paint crudely about and see what he gets. Sometimes such a fellow sells his paintings to poor fools like himself, or even gets a specious reputation, for a day, with the ignorant or with poseurs, as a wonderfully naïve genius; but he is no painter. He is a dauber; and he soon gets found out and despised. The artist must go to school and learn the dogmas of his art. Having learned them, it may be that, under some great inspiration, he can transcend dogma in the creation of works of genius greater than accepted convention alone could inspire; but even then he never ceases to have respect for the fundamental laws of his art. Only fools in any art despise their predecessors, or refuse to submit themselves to learn the dogma of the past.

Even so it is in religion; but not all people, especially in these rather silly days, seem to understand it. Tell the average person that the first step in religion is to submit to authority, and that that governs also the second step, and the third, and so on, probably for years, before ever one can walk alone, and he or she promptly gets offended. Urged on by some flighty elder flatterer, such as is always hanging around, burbling pleasantly, the young person especially is all too apt to start talking about obscurantism, and similar bogies, and to demand a freedom in respect to religion that he or she would never think of asking in the laboratory or the studio. He or she demands to be completely convinced about God before beginning, or continuing, the practice of religion. I confess I do not exactly see how such conviction is possible without submission to the

religious technique prescribed by the experience of the race, since philosophical argument alone will no more alone reveal the relationship of God to man than it will, alone, reveal the Mendelian law or the beauties of the Brahms Requiem. I suppose what he or she really wants, this strangely unreasonable young rationalist, is to have God "throw a miracle" to convince him or her individually. God simply will not do it. Knowledge is not imparted by cataclysmic fiat, by the bowling over of lazy people into wisdom.

The faith, then, is the formulation of what has been discovered when man has made venture of trust in a creatively Personal Being, existing beneath, behind, through, beyond the universe. The faith is expressed, of necessity, in symbolic language. *All* personal relationships are so expressed. But it is, for all that, a symbolic formulation of *true experience*, tested by the ages, tested still today. As such, *the faith* has relevancy, pertinency, applicability nowadays in exactly the same way that the ancient laws discovered by scientists and the dogmatic canons governing artists have relevancy, pertinency, applicability. None of these comprises all the truth that man will ever discover; but they are the best he knows now, after ages of experimentation and discovery; and that is quite enough to justify respect from them that have desire to learn. Most rejectors of tradition, in any field, are intellectual dilettantes, much more lazy than brave, much less creative innovators than a sort of racial blowing-off of steam. In every field of life it is the traditionalists who lead in progress, the dogmatists who dare.

II. Christian Faith

But, it may be asked, are there not many formulations of *the faith*, all entitled to respect and for precisely the reason you have given? To what degree, if at all, has *the Christian faith* an especial claim to adequacy and pertinency? Why may we not just as well go forth to live according to *the Buddhist faith* or that of *Mahomet* or that of *Zoroaster*?

The first thing to do with that question is for the questioner to examine himself carefully, to make sure that in asking it he is entirely honest. Is he really determined to follow *some* formulation of religious experience, and only in doubt about *which one* to adopt? Or is he merely seeking an excuse for inaction, saying that since all must be equally good he will go the way of none of them, but rather will lazily stop religiously stock-still and vegetative in the spot where he now happens to be? Is this person who doubts the finality of the Christian faith seriously out to arrive at completion of experience, or is

he, perhaps, like a grievously sick man who might say, " There are many remedies for cure of my disease, all of them good, possibly equally good; but I am not sure which is absolutely the best, and so I shall take none at all," and dies ?

It is true that there are other faiths beside the Christian one, and that many of them are wise and perceptive and helpful; but certainly any of the tried and tested faiths is better than no faith.

I should like to suggest two reasons for our entrusting ourselves to the Christian faith rather than to any of the others: first, that it is the normal formulation of the faith for us who live in the Western world; and, second, that it has a character singularly valuable for an educated modern man, sceptical about humanity, and a greater pertinency to the social problems facing us today than any of the other ancient creeds. Let us consider these two points severally, and with all possible brevity.

The first takes small argument.

Why go off to a civilization alien to one's own for one's religion, any more than for one's arts ? It is very difficult so to do. To most of us, traditional Chinese music is a mystery of jangling dissonance, alien to our ear; while both classical Japanese painting and Japanese ceremonial dancing seem strangely exotic. Similarly in religion, when I examine the *Avesta* of Zarathushtra, I find Mazda interesting but very odd. I can look into the *Upanishads*; but *Vedanta* remains to me an alien way of thinking about life, and involves an alien way of living it. Indian mythology is, to an Occidental, weirdly nightmare-like, and Indian ceremonial frequently inducive of a certain nausea. The maxims of Confucius or Lao Tzu̲ are probably for ever incomprehensible, at least as an adequate answer to the mysteries of life, to any except those who have lived under Chinese familism as their social system. Oriental religions are alien to the Occidental civilization. Why pursue them in preference to a way indigenous to our own culture ?

And again, why adopt those ways of religion that belong to cultures that are disappearing, or at best declining ? One hears occasionally a talk which ascribes to Oriental civilizations a toughness, an allegedly age-old vigour, that insures their eventual continuance when Occidental civilization has perished for ever. To say that is almost incredibly to disregard the facts of modern world development. Oriental *races* may well survive and flourish when Western races are no more, especially since the latter now seem to be going in for the racial folly involved in birth-control; but the Oriental *civilizations* are all decadent. Modern Japan is a *Western* nation in respect to

industry, commerce, politics, armament, costume, and the rest. It is like the West, only rather more so. Chinese civilization will go the same way; and indeed most Chinese thinkers wish it so to do, as quickly as possible. Nor can all the poetic heroisms of Ghandi slow down the transformation of Indian civilization by the impact of Western science and the steam machine. Social disintegration of what was the East is inevitable; reintegration into a neo-West is equally inevitable. Japan is not dangerous to America, or a possibly nationalized India to Great Britain, because Japan and India have Oriental, alien civilizations, very ancient and odd; but because they now have Occidental civilizations, very new, and are exceedingly able, eager, impatiently restless to fulfil their new-accepted destinies. We have a fear that they may be even as we, only perhaps more competent.

Those dynamic elements that are in control of this new East have found the religions of the old East, their old spiritual technics, more and more incompatible with the Occidental *geist* that increasingly prevails. It is a great deal easier nowadays for a modern Oriental to accept an Occidental religion than for a modern Occidental to find help in any of the religions of the Orient.

Accidentally or providentially, Christianity, which originated nearly twenty centuries ago at the very time and place where East and West divided and went their several ways, turned for its life and growth toward the dynamic West instead of toward the static East; toward the rational West instead of toward the mystical East. Thus it happens that, as the static and mystical East becomes at last, in this our day, also dynamic and rational, Christianity finds itself as relevant to the life and thought of one part of the planet as to another. It, and it alone among religions, has a world pertinency.

This has its chief bearing, perhaps, on discussion of the rationale of Christian missions; but here I mention it merely to justify advising one who would seek God to follow *the Christian faith—i.e.*, the Christian formulation of religious experience—rather than any other of the great religions, as probably more valuable to him than some faith that has prevailed in a past or passing way of living, feeling, thinking. Christianity is at least at one with the *geist* of a civilization that is now prevailing, rather than now dying. It may be that the modern world will temporarily abandon almost all religion; but if so, when it resumes, as it inevitably must, that search for reality in personal terms which is religion, it will do so in a post-modern life and thought with which the Oriental religions are wholly incompatible. It may well be that the religion of the future will be

neo-Christian; it will never be neo-Parsee, or neo-Vedantist, or neo-Confucianist, or neo-Mohammedan. If any religious tradition, any faith, has pertinency today, it is Christianity, the religion that grew along with that dynamic, rational way of life which more and more takes possession of the earth.

When we come to the second reason for our preferring the Christian faith to any other faith—namely, that the Christian faith is of a character singularly valuable for an educated modern man, sceptical about humanity, and uniquely useful to those who face the pressing problems of human preservation in a mechanized world—it is necessary again to define, this time to define the word Christian. What is Christianity ?

Christianity is an approach toward God based upon three convictions, or, if the word be preferred, three revelations : one, about the nature of man; another, about the nature of God; a third, about the way to unity between the two—this last a conviction that involves the significance of what is called " the Church." These three convictions, or revelations, must here, with an all too impossible brevity, be recalled to our minds if we are able to appreciate how fitted Christianity is to the temper of this modern day.

(1) What is the Christian conviction about man ?* The Christian is sure that man is a creature divided within himself; with a something within which bids him pursue, at any cost, truth, beauty and goodness; but with another something within him which drags him downward to the level of those lesser animals the sole determinant of whose lives is desire for food, drink, sleep, play and sex. These two tendencies, the Godward and the beastward, so contend within man that he is the most unreliable of all created beings. No one can afford to trust him very far. He dare not trust himself. He is perpetually surrendering to pressure of circumstances, and denying what he knows is right. And in respect to any real knowledge of what constitutes the good life, beyond its most rudimentary beginnings, he is for the most part densely ignorant. The crude savage in him lies very little below the surface of even the most apparently urbane culture. Only a few people, a tiny fraction of humanity, has wisdom enough for any proper leadership;

* What we are talking about is " man as man is." What man would have been, if he had not known sin, is not a matter of experience. Whether or not man is inherently divine, and the centre of the universe, as is maintained by such Sophiologists as Bulgakov, Berdyaev, and Soloviev, is an interesting speculation—highly flattering to the human race, it seems to me; but it is of no primary soteriological importance. What we as Christians are concerned with is first with what man is *as he is*—unredeemed, just the chap that lives round the corner, just you and me and the butcher. " It doth not yet appear what we shall be." " Now are we the sons of God," and sons of Belial, too: a little lower than the angels and often only a very little higher than brute beasts.

and the mob, in the long run, is more inclined to turn and rend the competent and noble few than to respect or follow them. Moreover, each generation must learn for itself the little it may learn of right living. The children will not believe what their fathers have learned, by costly trial and error, until they too have tried and erred. That prevents moral progress by way of education in the history of man's endeavour.

This obtuse human crowd, potentially saintly but always in fact sinful, needs mighty help from other than itself, lest its members wholly perish in mutual destruction. To this dull humanity must be shewn—shewn by extra-human intervention —what the good life, the perfect life, may be. Even more it needs an extra-human power for the fortifying of weak wills, for the making of men and women strong enough to defy circumstances, deny beastliness, rise to the stature of potential manhood. Poor unaided man is always a fool and usually a knave—mutally destructive, self-destructive, beaten before he starts. He needs redemption.

That is what Christianity says about man. The same thing is said of him by the psychologist and the historian. In fact, that is what man has always known to be the truth about himself, except occasionally, when he has indulged himself— till he came to, with a crash, in disillusioning disaster—in a sentimental self-flattery. We are now emerging from such a period of self-laudatory foolishness. Many people, most of the more ignorant, still go in for it—trusting in education and democracy and the pursuit of self-interest to bring in a perfect world, assuming that man is a good chap and ever getting better; but theirs is a faith that will not wash, and *really* modern people know that it will not. Civilization is in disintegration, ever more tottering, near to possible collapse. The thing that has failed is not social systems or political set-ups; the thing that has failed is man. This is an old story, as old as recorded history. Well, precisely such disaster as we see imminent is what Christian faith says will surely occur unless man be redeemed by something greater than himself.

The recognition of man's inability and instability is, of course, not peculiar to Christianity. All religions know it well, except modernist monistic Humanism (which is not really a religion, but only a conceit). But it is encouraging to him who would pursue the Christian path to note that the Christian concept of man is truly in accord with history, entirely compatible with psychology, sound when examined in the light of the science of human behaviour.

(2) What is the Christian conviction about God? The Christian is sure that He Who is Reality is such an one as we

have seen, do see, in Jesus : that Jesus is not only the perfect man, but also the Infinite One, revealing Himself in human terms. And what is the essential quality in this Jesus, and therefore in God ? Love—love which exerts itself for its own creative ends and for no extrinsic reward ; love which is expended, not in hope of being loved back again, but simply because that is the way God acts.

Such love men saw, superlatively revealed, in Jesus. They saw Him live for loving, and die still loving. And then they found Him yet alive, a cosmic fact ; and they adored Him, loving still. Such love as that wherewith He loved could redeem, and did redeem. Looking on Him, they knew the good life, what it is; but more than that, they gained from that same tireless love that He bestowed such power as gave them courage to face their own lives, not to be defeated by them, not to surrender to the animal within them, to be great and heroic souls for His sake. They put their trust in Him, their whole trust, and were not disappointed in their hope. Through Him they saw the Infinite, and in Him they rested in the strength of the Infinite. In Him they knew God, and were saved by God. The Unknown and Unknowable Deity was no longer a strange Absolute, but indeed a Father. And from Jesus, too, there came a Presence indwelling, also God, a Spirit who made strong, and guided in perplexity, and gave peace in the midst of turmoil. The Father was God ; Jesus was God ; the Holy Ghost was God : yet were they not three Gods, but one God. No longer did they fear the shifting sands of mere humanity. No longer did they put their trust in princes, nor in any child of man. They put their trust in Him, and found salvation from the evil world, the pull of flesh, the devil of conceit.

So it was in the beginning, and so it is now, and so it will ever be. In Jesus is strong refuge, from tyranny of time and space, in the heart of the Infinite ; and His love makes men and women not wholly insufficient to be free and happy people. This is the Catholic Faith of the ages, the Catholic Faith today—today, when men's hearts fail them not merely with fear of what is coming on the earth, but, even more, with fear that in the turmoil they themselves will fail and come to nothing. No other faith has the simplicity of this faith. No other so adequately reveals a God who is more than enough for modern man.

(3) And what is the Christian conviction about the Church ? The Church is the fraternity of them that put their trust in Jesus, in the God who is revealed in Jesus. The Church is the mystical Body, of which He is the Head and we are the grace-fed members, in which from Him flow life and grace and peace and

joy to them whom He redeems. But the Church is even more than that. In the Church, we who are Christians are not merely the redeemed, but also, with Him, co-redeemers of a world of men and women in need of redemption; not only the beloved, but, in and with and by Him, also the lovers; not only recipients of strength, but also, as a necessary part of the process of our own redemption, givers of strength to them who have it not. God grants—greatest of all gifts—a share in the Divine enterprise, the enterprise of loving men and women into righteousness.

Never was need greater than today for men and women brave, inwardly sure, capable of resisting for truly human ends the pressure of environment; and rarely in history have there been so few such men and women. The very intricacy of our machinery, the very complications of our life, the very abundance of our possessions, make the more necessary a sufficient interior integrity, which at the same time these attenuate, and often destroy. We perish for want of a self-disciplined virility; and no re-shuffling of the economic cards, no devising of political novelties, no mechanics of advancement, will give that which is lacking. Neither can more education do the trick alone, since education, at least as practised today, is either technical, in which case it increases efficiency without developing interior resources, or else it is analytical, in which case it leads only to disillusionment, bravely bidding the half-gods depart but not enthroning real gods on the emptied altars.

It is great lovers, selfless lovers, undeterred by lack of appreciation, loving enough to bear the pain engendered by a world in travail, loving enough to be rejected of the impercipient multitude, loving enough to face their Crucifix without dismay —it is they who are the man-rebuilders, the character-creators, the saviours of a perishing world. That such lovers may be, God loves His world from Cross and Altar, a King—King of the lovers who ask not love again; and we who find no lesser power in which to put our trust cry out, "Lord, we believe; help Thou our unbelief."

This it is about the Christian faith that makes it peculiarly apposite, startlingly pertinent, to our modern day, rushing on (as that day is) toward impending disaster. But it is not that the Christian faith is fitted *merely* to our day. It reaches down so deeply into the very fundamental nature of mankind; it is so concerned with basic human need; so independent of changing circumstances is the regenerating power of a wholly selfless love that its relevancy is timeless, ceaseless, forever. The world keeps turning, changing, involving and devolving systems, civilizations, cultures; but man remains man, and

God remains God, and the redemptive power of the love of Christ is still extended, by Him, first to us and, second, by that fellowship of the twice-born and co-redeeming lovers, called out from a dying world, which is the Church. The world, a thing of space and time, revolves: the Cross is cosmic, and it stands.

Kyrie Eleison and *Credo*, man cries, and God replies with *Caritas* and *Pax*.

Bernard Iddings Bell.

(*St. John's Cathedral, Providence, R.I.*)

THE FIFTH GOSPEL

The gospels are most provoking documents. They are at best sketches where we should welcome a three-volume biography. The synoptists in particular give two or three accounts of the same incident or parable without, in many cases, contriving to add anything appreciable to our knowledge of the central Figure, and the fourth gospel, written, it may be assumed, primarily to supplement and secondarily to correct, serves to shew how much more valuable any one of the other three would have been if it had not covered so much of the same ground as the other two. No intelligent Christian, forced to be marooned on a desert island with only three gospels, would hesitate for an instant which to choose. St. Mark's gospel, valuable as it is in a score of particulars, contains hardly anything that is not to be found in the other three.

But even taking the four "lives" together in a gospel "harmony" they form a volume so slender that it will go into the pocket, and where we long for the full-length portrait we are vouchsafed a picture but little larger than a miniature. It has been calculated that all the reported utterances of our Lord can be read at a reverent speed in an hour, whereas if He only spoke, either in public or to a select circle of followers, for an average of two hours a day over a period of two years and a half, He must have spoken for nearly two thousand hours, and as to the narration of events, we have the barest hints of the "many other things which Jesus did," which merely whet our appetites without satisfying them. The marvel is that such brief documents convey as much knowledge as they do, but if our Lord had had His Boswell or Plato, or even His Plutarch or Tacitus, how eternally we should be His debtors!

We are hampered, moreover, in our knowledge of our Lord by the fact that He deliberately chose as His followers men of limited intelligence. He expressed His thanks that His Father

had hidden " these things from the wise and understanding," revealing them " unto babes." They had to have the parables explained to them. " Are ye also without understanding ?" He exclaimed. The Jews made elaborate preparations to counteract a faked resurrection quite needlessly, for when the tidings came from the women they dubbed it " idle talk." *Intellexerunt Judæi quod non apostoli.* After all His teachings, spread over thirty months or so, they can naïvely ask, shortly before the Ascension, " Dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ?" As St. Paul put it, " not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble," were called. If an alert intelligence had been the qualification for apostleship, twelve very different men would have had to be chosen. It was from " fools and slow of heart to believe " that, directly or indirectly, the story of the great life had to emanate.

Yet it may be doubted whether intellectual geniuses would have fared better as evangelists. In the absence of any system of shorthand the writers had to rely on memory, and here the abler man may be no better than his fellows. We have in our four gospels not a complete life, but merely the sayings and incidents that " stuck." No doubt Mark i. 14-34 represents St. Peter's recollections of the first day that he saw our Lord at work. Who can forget the *first* day, of college, ministry, honeymoon ? Of incidents it was always the most remarkable that would, as a rule, make a dint on the memory. And of sayings, the hearers would remember what we remember in sermons and speeches, the epigrams and the stories. The writer once asked a parishioner who had gone to listen to a distinguished Presbyterian divine what he could recall of the sermon, which had helped the hearer considerably. All he could remember, beyond the general drift of the sermon, was an epigram. The whole discourse had done its work and been assimilated, but only the *bon mot* was remembered. The synoptists remember the pointed stories and the apophthegms ; it is only St. John, if the question may be begged, who attempts to reproduce a long conversation. Even the long denunciation of Matt. xxiii., though it reads like a consecutive discourse, is probably a collation of remarks recollected, one by one hearer and another by another, but not necessarily spoken at the same time. But if a literary genius would have succeeded in recalling more than the men of mediocre intelligence who give us their recollections at first or second hand, he could never have absorbed more than a portion of our Lord's teaching. The fourth gospel shews how much the synoptists missed. It is not an incident forgotten, like the miracle at Cana, nor a story incompletely told, like the feeding of the five thousand,

but a whole aspect that has eluded them. Nor can they be blamed. It is not often given to any one man to absorb and assimilate all the teaching of his master and hero; still less was it possible for any hearer of Jesus Christ's to reproduce in all its fullness the message of One Who was not a man but man, humanity in all its entirety, and withal God. Anyone reading the fourth gospel for the first time must needs put it down saying to himself, "Well, here is the same person doing the same kind of things and yet talking a new language and introducing many new themes." Yet he must modify this verdict; cannot he recall a verse in the first gospel that seemed a little out of keeping with the rest of it? He turns back to Matt. xi. 27, and sees now that the evangelist is recording a saying that somehow managed to stick in his mind though it met with little response in his heart, even if it formed a small fraction of a large body of teaching that the beloved disciple has preserved for us. When our Lord said that the seed which falls on good ground does not always yield equally, He may have been thinking of the seed He was sowing in the hearts of those dearest to Him. Certainly this one verse in St. Matthew looks like an oat-plant in a flower garden; the gardener may say to himself, "This is a curious weed, I never met it before," only to find it multiplied indefinitely in a field the other side of the hedge.

We recognize clearly enough that the gospel narratives are at best fragmentary. Sometimes, as Matthew Arnold put it, our Lord "was over the heads of the reporters," and even where they understood they could remember only the most striking sayings and doings, and to each one of the inner circle of followers there were sections and aspects of the teaching that never "got home": the seed fell but it never had a chance to germinate.

Eagerly, therefore, do we go outside the canon of the New Testament in the hope that some of the many gaps may be filled up for us, but not to much purpose. As Dr. Campbell puts it (*The Life of Christ*, p. 76): "They contain but little of value which is not found in the canonical gospels." We can make due allowance for any tendenciousness if only we may be given something that has been hitherto withheld. We could welcome the polemic of an opponent, for we can easily discount the hostility and seize with avidity upon the fresh angle, the new point of sight, and above all the hitherto unknown actions and utterances. For a foe is not necessarily more partial than a friend, and the work of a Lytton Strachey may serve as a counterweight to a biography that suppresses defects and magnifies excellencies, if only we can get something

new. There may be room for a new life of Gladstone, let us say, written by one who faced him across the floor of the House of Commons instead of sitting behind or beside him, written with the bias of an opponent as Lord Morley's life is written with the bias of a follower, but just as reliable where facts are stated, and informing also where impressions and opinions are given.

Such a writer of a life of Christ (we can hardly call him an evangelist) might have been able to give us many statements that escaped the friends of the Master simply because they antagonized him. Let a Christian listen to a rationalist orator in Hyde Park on a Sunday afternoon and his blasphemies will be more easily recalled than the defence of the faith made by an equally skilled orator fifty yards away. Not indeed that there is anything new: the age-long quibbles are served up again and can mostly be refuted from such a classic as Butler's *Analogy*. But they arrest the attention because they irritate by their staleness and wound by their cruelty. Unlike influences more than like, and that which we differ from violently is more likely to impress than that which commands our entire assent. A life of Christ written by an opponent would be a most informing document. Not only could we have a rationalistic explanation, however feeble, of some of His miracles, but we could read of saying after saying, bitterly resented and stored up faithfully in an antagonistic memory, which had slipped from the minds of all His followers.

Potential authors of such a life were numerous. Even before the clouds of opposition had gathered round Him and Jerusalem was no longer safe, even when He was almost universally popular and crowds wandered starving to hear or see some new sensation, there was criticism. "And when His friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold on Him: for they said, He is beside Himself" (Mark iii. 21). Dr. Campbell writes with reference to Matt. viii. 20 and Luke ix. 58: "It can only mean that Jesus was now cut off from His early home and domestic associations, whether of Nazareth or Capernaum, or both" (*op. cit.*, p. 212). All the evangelists cite the remark, "A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." Domestic opposition had taught Him that there are times when a man's real relations are not those who have physical but spiritual affinity with him (Matt. xii. 49-50, Mark iii. 34-35, Luke viii. 21). Was He thinking only of the future of the Church and not also drawing upon His own personal experience when he cited Micah vii. 6 in Matt. x. 35, 36 ? His foes had even been found among His own household, and He had to bequeath His mother to the care of a friend who was probably also her nephew.

We can therefore legitimately picture a little group of half-brothers and friends, old playmates, maybe, standing on the edge of a crowd, bitterly resenting the popularity of this youngster, their hearts blinded by jealousy to the truths of those utterances that bit all the more deeply into their hearts because they hated Him so. Even so must Saul, on guard over the discarded garments, have gnashed his teeth as blasphemy followed blasphemy in Stephen's speech, making their indelible marks on the tablets of his mind, and raged at the calm dignity of the dying martyr. Blinding hatred drove him along the Damascus road when all the world was enjoying its siesta, the dying man's final blasphemy repeating itself incessantly in his brain as he trudged through the dusty glare.

" All very true," it may be said, " but as this hostile ' life ' does not exist, why trouble to say it ?" The " life " does not exist, yet have we not certain " Recollections of an opponent "? A converted opponent, certainly, but one who would be more likely than anyone else to recall remarks that irritated and infuriated at the time.

Commentators of St. James' epistle have been content to demonstrate the parallelisms existing between certain verses in that epistle and the gospels, particularly the first, but is this all that can be said ? Is it certain that St. James is merely making statements that bear a similarity to certain statements in the gospels ? It is, of course, simple enough to point out in the notes to a work the existence of passages in other works that say the same thing. The commentator on *In Memoriam* will cite Clough's lines:

> " 'Tis better to have fought and lost
> Than never to have fought at all,"

and the critic of Hamlet will find a remarkable correspondence between Hamlet's reference to his hands as " these pickers and stealers " and a well-known phrase in the Church Catechism. But will these critics face the question of dependence, on the one side or the other ? The commentator on James v. 12 will remark that it is an almost verbatim citation of Matt. v. 37. The similarities between the first gospel and James are very well stated in H. W. Fulford's article in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, *s.v.* " James." But what if the epistle be very largely a list of remarks made by a once-hated half-brother and written down for the benefit of the Church ? Here we leave the region of certainty and pass into that of assumption; the question is, how far are the assumptions plausible ?

Two sections of the epistle can hardly owe much, if anything, to our Lord's teaching. The section, ii. 14-26, which deals with

justification may or may not have any reference to St. Paul's treatment of this theme, but so far as we know the subject was never broached by Jesus. The section with which the same chapter begins (*vv.* 1-4) is in every sense of the word Christian, but we may hesitate before we claim that it represents either the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord or the substance of any remarks of His. But what of the rest of the epistle ?

We may begin by wondering whether we have the original beginning and ending of the tract. Dr. Streeter remarks (*The Four Gospels*, p. 358): " The two ends of a roll would always be the most exposed to damage; the beginning ran the greater risk, but, in a book rolled from both ends, the conclusion was not safe." " The general epistle of James," if indeed it be an " epistle " in the same sense that the other twenty are epistles, lacks any adequate conclusion, and the opening verse may very well be the work of a transcriber who knew the author of his work but had only a torn fragment to copy. Who knows whether the work did not originally begin with a statement that it represented the recollections of an erstwhile opponent who had listened with disgust to teaching that at the time he regarded as heretical ?

Be that as it may, let the reader *assume* that the work is, with the exceptions already noted and possibly one or two others, a record of sayings of Jesus Christ. Then let him, with this hypothesis always before him, read the epistle once more. Remembering always that one religious teacher is likely to make much the same remarks as another on such a subject as control of the tongue, will he not nevertheless find it in nearly every case easy to believe that he is listening to the utterances of Jesus Christ Himself ? Let the reader of these pages make the experiment for himself.

He will find, to begin with, many traces of that love of nature that is such a charming feature of the gospel narrative. There is hardly a common object of the countryside that our Lord does not use to illustrate some great spiritual truth, but St. James does the same (i. 6, 11; iii. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12; iv. 14; v. 2, 3, 7). *Bis repetita docent* was a principle that our Lord followed; His parables or illustrations are frequently given in pairs, but there is a similar arrangement in the treatment of the bridle and rudder (iii. 3, 4); the forest-fire and the blazing chariot-wheel (iii. 5, 6); the fountain and the tree (iii. 11, 12); the moth and the rust (v. 2, 3).

Recollecting our Lord's use of paradox, he will find in i. 4, 9, 22, 25; ii. 10 statements that he can almost hear our Lord uttering. " Be ye doers of the word," " the law of liberty " —do these phrases seem out of place if inserted in one of the

gospels? If Renan (*l'Antéchrist*, p. 54), cited by Fulford, admits that some of the passages in the epistle are reminiscences of the words of Jesus, we need not hesitate to do the same. Fulford adds that "the most striking parallels are with the gospel according to St. Matthew," yet much of the epistle is more in sympathy with St. Luke's affection for the weak, the poor and the oppressed. Such passages as i. 9-11, 27; ii. 1-7, 14-16; iv. 13, 14, and above all v. 1-5 are teeming with that passion for social righteousness and justice in our Lord that St. Luke, from whatever source he drew, stresses so frequently. But St. James caught one or two aspects of our Lord's teaching that eluded the four evangelists. It is inconceivable that our Lord can never have mentioned wisdom. Almost personified as it had been in the Apocrypha, it must have frequently been not only on His own lips, but on those of every rabbi and scribe from Dan to Beersheba, yet in all the four gospels our Lord only uses the word once, in the famous text, "Wisdom is justified of all her children" (Luke vii. 35), or, as St. Matthew reports it (xi. 19), "by her works." St. James preserves four *dicta* of our Lord's about wisdom (i. 5; iii. 13, 15, 17), shewing that as an opponent he appreciated an element in our Lord's doctrine that escaped His friends. Again it is inconceivable that in nearly two thousand hours of teaching Christian doctrine our Lord said nothing about patience and long-suffering, yet the latter, so familiar in St. Paul and St. Peter, never occurs in the gospels, though St. James reports it once (v. 10), and the former occurs only twice in the gospels, in the parable of the sower, where the faithful bring forth fruit with patience (viii. 15), and in the promise to the persecuted of the future, "In your patience ye shall win your souls" (xxi. 19), yet St. James has three sayings in which the word occurs (i. 3, 4; v. 11). It is also inconceivable that our Lord did not say much about sins of the tongue. True, His insistence on fundamentals would always lead Him to that which lies behind the tongue. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh (Matt. xii. 34, Luke vi. 45). Yet in the Sermon on the Mount, which must have lasted many days, if not weeks, the subject is not mentioned. St. Matthew adds (xii. 36): "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment," but that is all. Is it fanciful to conjecture that the whole section James iii. 1-12 is, if not a *verbatim* report, at least a close approximation to an extract from one of our Lord's addresses? Put it into the Sermon on the Mount and is it incongruous there?

If what may be called the Johannine element in our Lord's teaching escaped St. James, as it almost escaped the synoptists,

see how he reinforces them as an authority on other aspects of His doctrine. Though only using the word hypocrisy once (iii. 17), he has caught the Master's detestation of that self-deceit that mars so much religious work (i. 22-26; ii. 14-18; iii. 14-18; iv. 4, 8, 12, 16), and he echoes the rebuke against faithless anxiety in Matt. vi. 25-34 in i. 9-11 and particularly in iv. 13-17.

Plagiarism ? Yes, to our way of thinking. No man today writes a tract composed of extracts from another man's sermons and serves it up as his own composition. But when the first and third evangelists used Mark and Q in the scissors-and-paste manner with which we are all familiar, it would be pardonable in St. James to put his name at the top of extracts from some *catena* of logia culled from various sources. But does the epistle read like such a thing ? Is it not a more reasonable hypothesis to believe that it may be a series of echoes, reverberations of discourses heard with inward misery or detestation on the hill-sides of Galilee, remembered the more accurately because so deeply offensive, and written down later in the intervals of a bishop's busy life ? " The fifth gospel "—why not ?

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

DEAN VAUGHAN AND HIS MEN

Charles John Vaughan was the eldest son of Edward Thomas Vaughan, Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester. He had two younger brothers, and these three followed their father in succession as Vicars of the Parish, the record of the family running from 1802-1893, a remarkable testimony to heredity.

Of Charles Vaughan it may be truly said that he was a great man, great whether as a schoolmaster, a parish priest, a preacher, a scholar, or counsellor.

As a schoolmaster he was appointed to the Headship of Harrow in 1844 at the age of 28. The school had fallen on evil days, and he found it at a low ebb, the numbers down to 85, but under the young Fellow of Trinity it soon revived and Harrow came into its own again.

After fifteen years he resigned, being succeeded in 1859 by his old pupil Montague Butler, and, putting aside all offers of high place in the Church, he chose to go as parish priest to Doncaster, which quickly learned the strength and influence of the great headmaster. Here he stayed for nine years, taking his full share in all the duties of a parish priest, and being most diligent in his work.

As a preacher he was probably at his best as Master of the

Temple from 1869 to 1894, where he had Canon Ainger as Reader, and where, in the succession of masters, he may well be counted to rank as second to Hooker.

When in residence he preached on Sunday mornings, and for twenty-five years firmly held his congregation of some of the most keen-witted, educated men in London. Those were the days of Darwin and Huxley, of fierce controversy between religion and science, but Vaughan never preached special sermons on the subject, never plunged into the arena. He was firmly convinced that in the Revelation of God in Christ Jesus men could find all they needed to satisfy them and to lead them safely through the mazes of life. His unswerving purpose was to bring home to men the message of God's redeeming love. Like St. Paul, he would know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. His message was always one and the same, based on what St. Ignatius describes as the Charters, the Foundation Facts: Jesus Christ, His Cross, His Death, His Resurrection, all presented with infinite variety of expression, exposition, the appeal made to the intellect no less than to the heart.

In his composition he was a master of English, and is described by one of the greatest preachers of that generation as the most remarkable he had ever heard, alike for thought, matter and style.

For the making of his sermon he would stand at a high desk, writing it all out. He took his MS. into the pulpit, but beyond turning over the page he never seemed to look at it. There was no impression of a read sermon, all was so arresting, so personal, so earnest, spoken in a beautiful voice, clear as a silver bell.

As a scholar too, he was great, the Senior Classic of his day at Cambridge, renowned for his firmness of touch. He was one of the revisers of the New Testament, which he spoke of as a wonderful, but often trying, experience. He was sure that some of the alterations he urged would be left out, and so they were.

As a counsellor he may be described as the Nestor of the Church. His correspondence was a very heavy one, and largely taken up with advice to laymen, as well as clergy who sought it. Men would come to him, and consult him, as Westcott, for instance, before deciding to accept the offer of the See of Durham.

While great in these ways, Vaughan was greatest of all in his influence on young men.

Of all his gifts, this was the greatest, which, discovered at Harrow, was developed at Doncaster, where he used to have young laymen working for him in the parish. This was

ultimately turned to good account in the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders. It was this that became the absorbing interest of his life, the preparation of young lives for the career which he regarded as the greatest to which a man can be called—the Ministry in the Church of God.

In his knowledge of this power, and of the possession of this special gift, maybe he found the real reason for his persistent refusal of preferment. *Nolo episcopari* was literally true of him, more than one bishopric being offered and refused, and when the greatest of all was made, the Prime Minister of the day sounding him as to the vacancy of Canterbury, he still refused.

This perhaps was partly due to his humility, for he was truly one of the humble, holy men of heart, and in this attitude he taught us to be humble-minded, never to look for preferment, but if it came, and it seemed right to accept it, to do so with all humility, deeply conscious of insufficiency and of the need of grace. "My Grace is sufficient for thee" was one of his favourite texts, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, as he would write in the Church Service he gave us on leaving him.

But the real reason for refusal was, no doubt, his sense of this gift that was peculiarly his, and that he must turn it to the best account in the training of men for their ordination, that this was his life work.

The real start was made in a University sermon at Cambridge. He deplored the lack of preparation for Ordinands, and the reproach it was that there was so much in this respect that could only be described as slipshod, careless and unworthy. He recognized to the full the work done by theological colleges, but he was sure that there was still much to be done, and he placed himself at the disposal of those who would apply to him. Of the condition of things at that time I can quote a case in point. After taking his degree in 1853, my father was ordained, being given a title in Essex, in the diocese of Rochester. At his interview with the Bishop he was asked whether he wished to be ordained, and on giving his answer, he was told when to present himself at the Cathedral, and this was the sum total of his preparation so far as the authorities were concerned.

In response to Vaughan's appeal replies soon came in, and from 1861 to 1896 the work went on steadily, year in, year out, no less than 452 passing through his hands, a record of which we may not unreasonably be proud, including as it does a goodly number of Bishops and one Archbishop in Randall Davidson. Men never stayed with him for more than a year, which was spent between Landaff and London. The number at a time was

on the average about twenty, and we lived either in lodgings at Llandaff or in Chambers at the Temple.

The work was entirely voluntary, a labour of love. Vaughan never took a penny for it, thankful as he was that he could render this service to his Church.

On one occasion a Surveyor of Taxes called and asked him for his return of the amount of fees he received from his young men. He could hardly believe that the work was all gratuitous, and is said to have gone away a puzzled and a chastened man. In taking his men he made two conditions, one, that of a B.A. degree at Oxford or Cambridge, the other, that of some connecting link either through your family or friends.

His methods were as unlike those of a theological college as could be, and sometimes, perhaps after ordination, we may have found ourselves somewhat lacking in the training and teaching of a theological college; but, on the other hand, it was a priceless privilege and experience to be with a man so saintly, so wise, so great, whose influence and impression was so lasting.

He had his own plan—"inapplicable to men who require either discipline to make sure of their conduct, or tuition to make sure of their reading"—a high standard, to which he generously gave us credit for living up to. He trusted us, and so far as we could we responded.

There is only one case on record of failure, of one man spoken of with bated breath, who was asked to go away.

Should anyone require correction, Vaughan had his own way of doing it.

One man who shewed signs of slackness and who had been deaf to several kindly hints was prostrated and cured by the quiet remark: "This is no school, we are only a body of friends, voluntarily submitting ourselves to preparation for the highest of all callings. Any one of my men who finds it tiresome is quite free to go. We are free as air, my dear Mr. So and So."

He made no attempt to coach you for your exam. This was left to yourself, and taken for granted. His knowledge of us was remarkable. After the first fortnight he seemed to know you through and through.

It was his personal influence that counted for so much, and in this was the secret of it all. There was a remarkable instance of this in my year. Among us was a man who made no secret of the good family living for which he was to be ordained. Vaughan apparently made no special effort, but at the end of the first term there was a marked change in our friend, and when the year ended he left with a keen sense of vocation.

In his treatment of us there was nothing of the Don or Divine. He was more the Good Companion, treating us as equals.

In his views he was no narrow ecclesiastic who wished all to be alike.

There was nothing stereotyped in his handling of us, no mould in which we were cast, no label which could fairly be attached to us. He himself had a horror of labels, a dread of the one type, of anything artificial or mechanical. "Do be human," he would say.

In his choice of men he did not pick and choose according to their views, nor did he interfere with men in their views. Among us were many different types of Churchmanship, and it was an excellent experience for us to have as we did, and as men do at that age, keen and earnest and often heated talk on opposite points of view. It no doubt helped us to take a broad and charitable outlook, and not to expect others necessarily to hold similar views to ourselves.

Our week's programme was as follows: On Tuesday mornings we went to him for two hours to read the Greek Testament. He was a great authority on St. Paul and the Epistles. He expected you to know, without reference, the contents of each chapter of the Acts as soon as St. Paul arrives upon the scene. He gave us a wonderful insight into the Epistles, emphasizing the importance of the Greek particles, the value of the tenses, bringing out the meaning of nouns, adjectives, and verbs, with their special derivations. It was all an illuminating experience, and we took down notes as best we could.

On Thursday evening we spent with him a devotional hour. On Saturdays we sent in a sermon on a text that he had given us, and which he returned on the Tuesday with some criticism in the margin, incisive but always kindly.

Once a fortnight he had us in by ourselves to tea in his study, when for half an hour he would talk in the most intimate, confidential way on events of the day, on people that he knew, and those in high position whether in the Church or State.

This was one of his ways of trusting us, and no one to my knowledge was ever the worse for such talks. On the contrary, the fact of being so confided in, so treated almost as an equal, gave one the feeling so welcome and invigorating at that age.

As to curacies, he was most particular, sending us almost invariably for the first start to large industrial parishes under the charge of his own men whom he knew he could rely upon. In my own case the Vicar of Rotherham, who had given me a title, died before the time came to go to him. In his place

the Vicar of St. George's, Barrow-in-Furness, who was Archdeacon of Furness, and who happened to be my godfather, came forward with an offer, but he was not, as Vaughan would say, "one of us," and there was quite a difficulty in getting consent to accept it. Vaughan did not approve of men staying too long in a parish. He was afraid of their "settling on their lees." His advice to us in dealing with doubters was helpful: "First find what ground you have in common, and make that your starting-place."

On work overseas he had strong views, and in advance of his time. He warmly approved of men going out when young, at the same time holding that their return should be welcomed for the benefit of the Church at home. He saw no reason why a man's term abroad should be for life, and strongly advocated that his experience should be made by our Bishops a reason not against, but in favour of, employment and preferment in the Church at home. On the other hand, he maintained that the Colonial Episcopate ought to plant itself in the Colonies, and that once a man accepted such a Bishopric he should look upon himself as "a lifelong inmate, and not as a temporary sojourner." He had the satisfaction of seeing three of his men as Bishops, in Tasmania, Natal, Melanesia, on these conditions, and one who, foreseeing the necessity of eventual return to England, declined the offer of the Bishopric of Lucknow.

In his personal religion, and in his teaching, he had no place for sentiment or emotion. He would impress upon us the importance of building upon facts as incorporated in the creeds and in the life of the Incarnate Son of God. He would plead with us to draw from them such information as fired St. Paul and as has accounted for the lives of saints through the ages.

As a Churchman I would describe him as an Evangelical of the best type.

In appearance he was of middle height, very well made and proportioned. He had a very fine head, most kind smiling eyes, with a decided twinkle in them, and a pair of the most shapely calves for gaiters that you could wish to see. He lived a sedentary life, one of those men who never take exercise and rarely take a holiday. He was a most hard worker. After dinner, even when there were guests, he would disappear and lock his study door, returning later on to the drawing-room for prayers. His correspondence occupied a great deal of his time, sometimes thirty letters a day, all written while standing at his desk. Servants would do anything for him. He had great charm of manner. When you were with him, while you felt that you were in the presence of a great man, you never felt awkward, nervous or shy. He at once set you at your ease.

He had a quaint way of putting things. After being laid up for a day or two by a chill he would say he had been suffering from "unwellness," and on one occasion when he had heard of one of his men emerging from narrow views and ways, he described him as a "rectified Evangelical." He could be very caustic if he chose, and it was always said that he had to keep a great restraint upon himself in this matter. I only had one instance of this myself. At one of those half-hour afternoon teas in his study the conversation had turned on the Cathedral services, at which one of the dignitaries when in residence used to afflict us all sorely by his preaching, Vaughan included. In his quiet way he summed up these sermons in the most devastating of criticisms, "Rinsings, Harman, mere rinsings." This, however, was very unusual. He very rarely let himself go, for he was the most kind and gentle of men, always quick to look for and find the best in others.

Among our company each year there were generally included some outstanding, interesting men. In my year there was Magee, son of the famous Bishop of Peterborough and Archbishop of York, extraordinarily like his distinguished father in looks, and unfortunately he considered himself equally like him in brains and ability, but somehow the authorities never took the same view. He never got the preferment to which he thought he was entitled, and lived and died a disappointed man.

Benson, too, was in the same year, the youngest of the three brothers, "little Benson" as we always called him. At that time it was said that he was considerably under the domination of an old family nurse, and he had strong Protestant views. He used to amuse us very much, reminding us of an overcharged soda-water syphon in hot weather, always bubbling over, effervescent, ardent, excitable in his talk. He gave no sign then of leaving his Church as he did in 1897, some time after Vaughan's death.

Of himself, Vaughan forbade any biography to be written.

Among memorials to him there is the fine lectern in the Temple Church, dedicated by the Archbishop Randall Davidson, and designed by the architect, W. H. R. Blacking.

There is also the Memorial Church, St. Martin's, Kensal Rise. We had our Triennial Gatherings, the last held in 1925, when we spent a delightful day at Lambeth Palace and enjoyed the generous hospitality of Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson. One hundred and twenty of us were present, and as it seemed to me in our variety of dress, some with white ties, some in the more regulation clerical attire, some in the uniform of their Order, how typical it all was of that comprehensiveness which is such

a feature of our Church, and no small part of her glory, and which Vaughan so gladly recognised and so keenly appreciated.

But after all, Vaughan's best memorial is in this special work which he did for his Church, of which he was so distinguished a member and so devoted a servant.

In writing of him no account would be complete without some mention of Mrs. Vaughan, a remarkable woman and a great character. She was a Stanley by birth, daughter of Edward Stanley, Bishop of Norwich, who died in 1849, and sister of Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster. In later life, especially in London, she gathered round her many famous and interesting people. She was very well read, with a wonderful power of conversation, great wit and originality. She was very hospitable and kind to us, asking us in to meet her guests. She was afflicted with a nervous movement, a curious jerkiness which sent her napkin flying across the room three or four times at a meal. No one surely has poured out tea as she did. With a large tray in front of her, full of cups, she used the teapot as a watering can, passing it backwards and forwards above the cups, into which some drops of tea found their way, but most of it was on the tray, and all the while she was talking vigorously, engrossed in her conversation. She was an extraordinarily clever mimic, and it was not a little embarrassing as you saw the people whom she had so well taken off coming into the room. In the drawing-room at Llandaff there were two large cabinets which contained her very interesting collection of London street toys, and which, when we happened to be there, we were called upon to show off to the guests after dinner. With all her wit, Mrs. Vaughan never got the better of the Dean. If she tried to cross swords with him she always got the worst of the encounter. At a large luncheon party I well remember her speaking down the table and saying, "There! Charles takes no interest in antiquities or archæology. Why, if he was told that Pharaoh was walking on the pavement opposite he wouldn't go across the street to look at him." "No, my dear," came the answer back without hesitation. "But if it was Pharaoh's daughter I might."

On another occasion when Vaughan was very ill, and his life despaired of, four years before his death, Mrs. Vaughan, taking no risks, bought herself a house at Eastbourne and furnished it. Vaughan, however, recovered, and to his great amusement and delight went to spend his convalescence in the very house that his wife had secured for her widowhood.

With all her peculiarities, she was a serious-minded woman, with strong religious convictions. She used to write for S.P.C.K.

and brought out a little work, *Rays of Sunlight for Dark Days*, for the use of mourners and those in sorrow.

It was all a unique experience, a delightful time to look back upon, and one which has given those who had the privilege to enjoy it much to be thankful for.

Such a retrospect is like the opening of a door into another world. Faced as we are in these post-war years with such different conditions, absorbed as we are in our new surroundings, it seems a far cry back to it all.

The contrast between the Then and Now is so great, the gulf between Them and Us is so wide, that there seems to be no connecting link.

But we must not let things get out of proportion.

The Past, so far from having vanished, is ever a part of the Present, marching on with us. It has its value, its message.

From time to time it is well to bring to mind those who from their generation still speak to us, still belong to us.

It is well to recall how they compass us about, helping us to do in our day what they did so well in their day, to focus upon the Future the light of the Faith by which they lived, the same for us as it was for them, as it must be for those who come after us, so that as the years pass there may stand out in ever clearer, bolder outline the vision of "the City which hath the foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God."

A. C. Harman.

THE FISHERMAN'S GOSPEL

Theories have lately been put forward abroad, and more recently in England, concerning the origin of the second gospel, which assert that it was based on several earlier documents pieced together by a late editor, and so discredit the traditional account of Papias. In view of these theories any new light, however small, which tends to support the tradition that the gospel was based on St. Peter's preaching at Rome may be of interest. Others have dwelt on the vivid touches which suggest that the gospel is based on the account of an eyewitness, and on the indications that that eyewitness was St. Peter. Professor Turner in particular has declared that the gospel may be called autobiographical, and has pointed out how often it shews evidence of being an expression of St. Peter's point of view, and how in one case it even records his very thoughts. (*New Commentary*, vol. ii., pp. 48 and 49.) The present writer may perhaps be able to add to this evidence

in one particular. He was brought up at a fishing port, and has had much to do with boats on sea, lake, and river, and has also seen a good deal of fishermen. So it occurred to him that there might be some special indications of a fisherman's point of view in the stories of events on the Sea of Galilee recorded in the second gospel which would probably be omitted or blurred in the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Luke. On examination of the gospels it seems to him that this expectation is rather strikingly fulfilled. The first of such passages is St. Mark i. 18-22=St. Matthew iv. 18-22. This describes the call of the first four apostles. The passage is short, and St. Matthew or his editor follows St. Mark almost word for word, so there is little opportunity for anything distinctive of the fisherman to emerge in comparing the two accounts. Yet even here there is one thing, mentioned in the second gospel and omitted in the first, which is just what a fisherman would note as being of importance, whilst a landsman would pass over it because he would not see the reason for mentioning it. Both groups of fishers seem to have been preparing for the night's fishing when Jesus called them. Peter and Andrew were catching small fish for bait with a hand-net (*ἀμφίβληστρον*) in preparation for line fishing; and Zebedee and his sons were mending their deep-sea nets. (*δίκτυα* is the word used in the gospels for the large deep-sea nets; see article in THEOLOGY, January, 1934.) St. Mark alone mentions that Zebedee had with him hired servants as well as his sons. To leave their father alone when he was just starting out for a night's net-fishing (he might have managed line-fishing alone though he could not have worked the nets alone) would seem to any fisherman a most unfilial and unseamanlike act. So St. Mark is careful to mention that James and John did not do this. St. Matthew, being a landsman, has omitted the detail because its importance did not strike him.

The other two passages which describe nautical episodes are the records of the two storms on the lake. The first of these, in Mark iv. 35-41=Matt. viii. 23-27; Luke viii. 22-25, short though it is, reveals the eyewitness and the fisherman in many striking details which the others omit. St. Mark alone makes it clear that the order to cross the lake was given by Our Lord at the end of a long day of teaching by parables, during which He had used St. Peter's boat as a pulpit (iv. 1). Evidently the reason was that He was worn out by His labours and required rest. St. Mark alone says that they took Him "as He was in the ship"—*i.e.*, sitting in the stern as He had been sitting all day teaching. His weariness and the pressure of the crowd forbade them to land to obtain additional provisions

or clothing. Both Matthew and Luke on the other hand speak as though He embarked just before the voyage began. St. Mark only mentions that other boats accompanied them. These might be boats full of listeners who wished to hear Him again. More probably, in view of the evening hour, they would be the Capernaum fishing fleet putting out for the night's fishing. Now St. Mark's point in mentioning the other boats is, as any seaman would recognize, to make it clear that when they started the storm had not arisen and the weather was not even seriously threatening. Had a storm started, or been obviously coming on, fishing would have been impossible, nor would other boats, especially if they were small boats (the reading πλοιάρια has much support, though rather less than πλοῖα), have been likely to accompany them for any other reason. The description of the storm in all the evangelists suggests that it was unusually sudden as well as unusually violent: λαῖλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου (Mark); λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου (Luke). According to Aristotle λαῖλαψ is a cyclone or whirlwind, the most sudden and violent of all types of storm. St. Matthew calls it "σεισμὸς μεγας," "a great earthquake," which implies even more clearly suddenness as well as violence. What no doubt struck St. Peter as strange was that both he and all the other fishers of Capernaum, weatherwise as fishermen are, put to sea without noticing any signs of the coming storm. Cyclones are usually heralded by thunder clouds and oppressive heat. St. Mark again alone tells us that Our Lord was asleep in the *stern*, out of the way of the rowers, upon the "προσκεφάλαιον." The word literally means a pillow. As, however, the article suggests that there was only one, and that it was a regular part of the boat's equipment, the best suggestion seems to be that it was the cushion or seat for the steersman. In those days rudders and tillers had not been invented, and boats were steered by a large oar stretching out behind the stern. In stormy weather, or when quick turns were necessary, the steersman would have to stand to use his full strength; but in calm weather, when the boat was on a straight course, he would be able to steer sitting. On this occasion evidently the steersman had vacated his seat at the outset to provide Our Lord with the most comfortable place to rest in. Again St. Mark not only says that Jesus "rebuked" the wind, a word which in itself seems to suggest that He was speaking to a person, but he also gives the very words of the command to the waves "σιώπα, πεφίμωσο," literally "silence, be muzzled." Archbishop Trench and many later commentators infer that the words imply that Jesus realized that Satan was causing the storm. Sir Edwin Hoskyns, in his recent book

The Riddle of the New Testament, goes further and states that the words were a regular formula of exorcism, pointing out that Jesus used the latter word in casting out the devil in the synagogue (Mark i. 25). Again St. Mark gives the exact words of the disciples' appeal to the Lord with their implied reproach, "Teacher, carest Thou not that we perish?" He also gives the Lord's reply in its full sternness, "Why are you such cowards? Have you not yet faith?" There must have been something specially unusual and terrifying about this storm, since it could cause such terror to seamen and cause them to make an almost abject appeal for help to a landsman, whom as yet, according to this earliest and most authentic account, they reverenced only as a teacher. One needs to know fishermen to appreciate the full significance of this, and it seems to accord with what we know of St. Peter, that, having learnt to the full the lesson of humility (1 Pet. v. 5), he should record most fully a terror of which as a seaman he must afterwards have been specially ashamed. All the three gospels record that the cessation of the wind was followed at once by a complete calm (*γαλήνη μεγάλη*). Ordinarily it would take some time for the waves to subside after the cessation of the wind, even on a lake, and this sudden cessation of the waves would strike even the landsmen amongst the twelve, if they were present, as unnatural. In fact, all the evangelists declare that Our Lord rebuked both the winds and the sea, and all record the wondering awe of the disciples as they said to each other, "Who then is this, that both the winds and the sea obey Him?" Clearly there was something uncanny about this storm, both in its start and in its ending; and this point is most clearly emphasized in St. Mark, as we should expect if the account came from a fisherman. The only other nautical episode described by St. Mark is the second storm at sea which followed the feeding of the 5,000 (vi. 47-52; *cp.* Matt. xiv. 22-34 and John vi. 16-21). The greater part of the account in each of the evangelists is given to the description of Our Lord's walking on the water, and there are only one or two verses which describe the storm and the state of the ship and rowers. Yet even in the few words of description there is one point mentioned in St. Mark which strikingly records the experience of a fisherman, and which, both in St. Matthew and by our own translators, has been misunderstood and so misrendered. In Mark we read that Jesus saw the disciples "*βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλάυνειν*"—*i.e.*, "tortured as they voyaged, for the wind was contrary." St. Matthew transfers the word to the boat and says that it was "*βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων*," using the word in the metaphorical sense of "tossed" by the billows. Our

translators also have softened down St. Mark's words to "toiling in rowing" (A.V.), "distressed in rowing" (R.V.). No doubt this is because both they and St. Matthew, or his editor, were landsmen and the word "tortured" seemed to them exaggerated. If, like the writer, they had ever had the same experience as St. Peter and his crew—*i.e.*, a long row against a violent head wind and sea—they would have known that the word was not at all exaggerated. The force of the wind, and the head seas into which the boat is being driven, stop her way between each stroke, so that each stroke means the setting in motion of a dead weight against violent resistance, and requires the utmost effort of which the oarsman is capable. The weight is increased by the water shipped in such a storm. To stop is impossible, because, as soon as the boat loses steerage way, her bow falls off and she gets broadside on to the sea, and is liable to be swamped. For the same reason turning round and running back to the shore they had left would have been most dangerous, and, even if they had reached it, landing on a "lee shore," on which the wind and waves were beating, would have meant shipwreck. When we remember that the disciples had already crossed the sea early the previous morning, and had spent most of the day helping Jesus to minister to the crowd, so that they were tired when they started, we can understand that "tortured" was a literal description of the rowers' feelings. Muscles must have been cracking and lungs and hearts almost bursting with the strain. But only one who had actually experienced it would be likely to use so strong a word. St. John does not reproduce the word, perhaps because he was steersman, in which case his labour would not be quite so hard. But he does add one or two touches which suggest the fisherman and specially the steersman. He mentions that they had gone five and twenty or thirty furlongs—*i.e.*, they were nearer the shore to which they were going, for they were crossing the north end of the lake, and not its widest part. The fact that they had advanced so far was an argument in favour of going on, as it would have made turning and attempting to regain the shore they had left too dangerous, especially in view of the heavy sea which he specially mentions. The steersman would be best able to notice the state of the sea and the distance they had gone, and on him chiefly it would fall to decide whether going on or attempting to turn was the less dangerous course.

This, however, is rather a digression from St. Peter and his share in St. Mark's Gospel. The writer feels that, in that gospel at least, the mind of the fisherman is clearly to be traced by anyone with a little nautical experience, and it seems to him

that this should be given due weight when the question of rejecting the traditional account of its origin arises.

Perhaps he may be permitted to add one other word. If the traditional account is correct, and the gospel is based on St. Peter's public preaching at Rome, it is clearly beside the point to argue, as modernists so often do, that its authors knew nothing of Our Lord's virgin birth. Preaching to audiences largely unconverted, in such a city as Rome was then, both reverence and common sense would forbid him disclosing that sacred mystery. Only the fully converted and baptized, such as Theophilus, who had felt the power of Christ's grace and become convinced by experience of His divinity, would be ready to listen with reverence and to accept gladly the account of how God the Son assumed manhood. The more valid argument seems to be that the omission of the story of the birth and infancy, and the confining of the gospel story chiefly to Jesus' work in Galilee, where the response of the common people enabled His love and spiritual power to shine out most clearly, tells in favour of Papias' account of its origin. A gospel intended for inquirers would naturally be chiefly confined to His acts of love and power. Only when inquirers had thus been led to feel that He was above all standards of merely human greatness would they be prepared to listen favourably to His teaching and to the revelation of His divine origin.

M. Buchannan

(*St. Alban's Rectory, Kimberley, South Africa*).

MISCELLANEA

THE PARABLE OF THE TARES

Most commentators find it difficult to explain the Parable of the Tares and are far from satisfied with the interpretation given in Matt. xiii. 37-43. Some would go so far as to reject the parable altogether as an expansion of the "seed growing secretly" in Mark iv. 26-9; but even if we accept the story as it stands in Matt. xiii. 24-30 we must reject his explanation of it. Now Dr. McNeile has pointed out that the interpretation stands on a different footing from the parable itself. Not only is it stilted and mechanical but it reflects a later stage in the growth of the Church. Moreover, there appears to be a confusion between the Church and the world, and the situation envisaged suggests a time when there had already been much missionary activity. In short, it is impossible to believe that the explanation can have come from our Lord Himself.

On the other hand, it may well be that Christ did give His disciples an explanation of the Tares, for we know that "privately to His disciples He used to explain everything" (Mark iv. 34). The difficulties experienced by commentators in trying to interpret the parable suggest that its meaning is by no means so obvious as that of the Sower to which it bears a striking resemblance. But is this true? The key to the problem is to be found in the similarity between the Sower and the Tares.

In the parable of the Sower the seed is the word. We should therefore conclude that in the Tares the wheat is the true teaching and the tares the false teaching. Just as the Sower sows the truth in the hearts of men (some of whom are hard-hearted, some shallow-hearted and others half-hearted), so in the Tares the Son of man sows the truth (the wheat) in men's hearts, but the evil one sows false teaching (the tares). Thus each parable reflects the experience of Jesus and shews why the Kingdom did not spread more rapidly. In the first instance His preaching does not always bear fruit because of the hardness of men's hearts. In the second instance the word is thwarted by the teaching of the devil.

It is significant that the word translated tares means darnel, which is not an altogether different seed but a degenerate kind of wheat indistinguishable from the true wheat. The tares are therefore symbolic of perverted truth. And the parable teaches us that it is beyond human power to pronounce a final judgment. That is the prerogative of God alone. And even then it is the seeds of falsehood and not the evil people themselves that are destroyed.

Such an explanation is surely more in accordance with the mind of Christ than one which interprets the tares as bad people who are not to be excommunicated from the Church but who, at the end of the world, will be consigned to the furnace of fire (Matt. xiii. 42). Such a notion is of course typically Matthean but quite un-Christian. It was probably suggested by the words attributed to John the Baptist in Matt. iii. 12: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly cleanse his threshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire."

V. A. Holmes-Gore.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

EPHEMERIDES THEOLOGICÆ LOVANIENSES. February, 1937.

The first article in this number is by the Jesuit Father E. Bergh on the nature of Religious Profession. Profession has two sides; on the one hand it is essentially an interior disposition of the soul desiring to serve God perfectly in the life of the Evangelical Counsels, yet on the other hand it has a juridical side and occupies a large chapter in the Canon Law. This connexion between an interior movement and legal enactments makes the subject of no little complexity and difficulty. Father Bergh traces the history of profession and of the various theories on the subject. From this study the importance of the Institute (monastic order, etc.) and of its Superior, to which and to whom the professed religious engages himself, come into clear relief. Here is what really makes profession different from any other sort of vow to God. The Church confides part of her own powers to the Institute which she sets up within her own borders. Profession thus includes duties and obligations to God, to the authorized Institute and to the Church. It is the act whereby the individual freely engages himself to a " holocaust of charity." It differs in essence from any ordinary contract and its definition may be " a public Act of Religion whereby a man promises to God the practice of the Evangelical Counsels of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience in an approved Institute and in virtue whereof he submits himself to the jurisdiction and domination of his lawful Superiors."

The second article, by Father Pinedo, is a lengthy and very learned comment on the Procession of the Holy Ghost. That the Procession of the Son or Word is made by way of intellect may be regarded as " theologically certain," but so much cannot be said of the Procession of the Spirit by way of Love. Augustine was the first Doctor of the Church to speak of the Procession of the Spirit in this way, of " Will " or " Love." As, however, this idea cannot be said to rest on any direct foundation of Holy Scripture or of tradition, we must speak of it as *doctrina communis* only. The teaching of the Greek Fathers is, generally, that the method of the Procession of the Holy Ghost is beyond the human intelligence, and imposes silence on our curiosity. The article proceeds to give a very full commentary on the doctrine of St. Augustine as developed in the West. In Augustine himself it is regarded from two angles, either that the Holy Spirit is the love which the Divine Will takes in its own perfect Nature or as the love which unites the Father to the Son and the Son to the Father. The author of the article gives reasons for his preference for the first of these points of view as avoiding anthropomorphism inherent in a theory of mutual love in the Blessed Trinity.

Another article gives an account of the John Rylands Library papyrus from Fayyoum containing certain *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*. This document contains a number of Old Testament texts for use in controversy with Jews. They are here compared with the extant *Testimonia* of Cyprian.

A few other shorter articles and the usual book reviews complete the number.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus LV—Fasc. I et II.

To many people the most interesting article in the current number is the account given of the revival a century ago of the Bollandist undertaking, after it had been closed down when the enemies of the Convention invaded Belgium in 1794. The Bollandists date the beginning of their enterprise from 1615, though Jean Bollandus, who gave his name to it and was responsible for its final shape and scope, was first associated with it in 1630. The sixth October volume appeared in 1794; there was then an interval of fifty years before publication of October Volume VII in 1845. With the whole of December and more than half November still to be dealt with, and with each folio volume only disposing of two days of the calendar, the end of the work lies far ahead; it must be easily the most prolonged literary undertaking on record.

The number also contains an interesting article on "Les Caracteristiques et Les Attributs Des Saints Dans la Peinture Cappadocienne." The author distinguishes between attributes and characteristics. Attributes are things added to the saint by way of designation—the keys of St. Peter, for instance, or a halo. Characteristics are a part of the saint, like a beard, or a gesture, or attitudes. The distinction is new to most English readers and not without advantages.

The number also contains a new life, hitherto unpublished, of Conrad of Herlesheim, an article on Irish saints entitled "Hagiographica Celtica," one containing an account of four miracles of St. Martin of Tours, now published for the first time, and the "Bulletin des Publications Hagiographiques," which is as full and informative as usual.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

God and the Modern Mind. By Hubert S. Box, Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 10s.

The purpose of this very able book is the refutation of the falsities and fallacies employed by scientists, philosophers, psychologists and humanists when they discuss the existence and being of God divorced from the Christian dogmatic foundation. Dr. Box is well acquainted with these modern writers of England, America and the Continent, and he gives many long extracts from their works. The only thing to be said against this excellent book is that there is too little of the writer's own words; over five hundred quotations in two hundred and sixty-one pages is somewhat tedious for the reader unaccustomed to systematic study.

The book starts with a survey of what modern writers mean by " God," and they mean almost anything from social etiquette to subjective phantasy. Dr. Box wisely stresses the point that there is a marked confusion between " God " and " the idea of God," and " it is God—not the idea of God—that men worship " (p. 15). Careful criticisms are made of so-called modern ideas of God—the Finite God, the Struggling God, the Evolving God, the God dependent on His creation, the God who is supreme among a " world of Spirits." If the Christian be condemned for making God in his own image, these writers must be condemned for making God in the image of many men and movements.

The chapter on " Anti-intellectualism " is exceptionally good and necessary in these days when logic and reason are being scorned in preference for experience. Though as *The Cloud of Unknowing* so well teaches, God is " incomprehensible by their knowing and not by their loving," the head must substantiate what Pascal would call the " reasons of the heart." As a disciple of St. Thomas, Dr. Box will have nothing to do with an irrational faith—" no experience can be accepted as a source of knowledge till it has been examined by the intellect. . . . We ought not blindly to give credence to the dictates of a non-rational faculty " (pp. 113-114).

The last three chapters are excursions into profound philosophy, and will well repay careful reading. Religious Experience, Value and Being are familiar problems to philosophical readers, and Dr. Box has much to help one through them. Perhaps especially the discussion on " The Philosophy

of Value " is important in view of a modern semi-Platonic idea that God is merely Beauty, Truth and Goodness instead of being the " Value of Values." Wisely Dr. Box says that " values, then, cannot be the chief consideration in religion, because God is not a value, and to regard Him merely as the Ground of values and the Conserver of our highest interests is to move the centre of reference away from God and towards man " (pp. 192-3). So in jig-saw fashion Dr. Box goes on his way, discarding, accepting and amplifying thought about God, until at last he compiles a miniature Thomistic picture of the Deity. Once again the writer has put us in his debt by directing thought away from the sands of speculation to that rock on which Thomism is so powerfully and persuasively founded, and which today in Anglican circles is being advertised and advocated by real thinkers like Dr. Box and Father Hebert.

PATRICK COWLEY.

" THE PARISH COMMUNION." Edited by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

The question has no doubt been presenting itself during the past months as to what is really involved in the Recall to Religion with regard to the Church itself. How far is the Church ready and able to minister to those who are being re-called ? Why is it, for example, that so many, baptized into the Christian faith, have given up taking their part in public worship ? Can this in some measure be due to the failure in the past to teach our people *how* to worship, which has not been rendered more easy by the present unsatisfactory condition of affairs which surrounds our services of worship in parish and school chapel, and the lack of continuity between them ?

To ask these questions is to give a reason for the Liturgical Movement which is taking place in every part of Christendom to-day, in which the Parish Communion is one of the most important and hopeful signs of this awakening. Its importance lies in the fact that the Parish Communion is springing up quite spontaneously in parishes with varying traditions, and in different parts of the country, where priest and people have tried to face anew the very *raison d'être* of the Church, its vocation to offer worship to Almighty God through Jesus Christ our Lord within the fellowship of His Body the Church.

The time is therefore most opportune for relating the Recall to Religion to a recall to worship and to a better understanding of its meaning by learning what this Liturgical Movement

can teach us. For this reason we are grateful to Father Hebert for this book of essays, in which he claims "that the Parish Communion is a key point of this Liturgical Movement." The essays approach the subject from different angles, but in the main they present a challenge to the prevalent custom of making one's Communion at an early service and worshipping at a later service—*i.e.*, separating Communion from worship. They further maintain that by combining Communion and worship in the *one* service, a return is made to primitive custom and to the true spirit of the Liturgy. Further, the *one* service helps us to recover the corporate aspect of this sacrament of fellowship, a thought which finds expression throughout the book.

But for whom is the book intended ? If it is for the Church as a whole, and for the guidance of parish priests who are thinking of educating their parishes to desire such a service, there are two serious omissions; its lack of reference to the ministry of the Word, and its want of appeal to Evangelicals. If the parish Communion is to win its way, and those of us who have had experience of this service hope that this will be the case, both these omissions must be faced. The lack of reference to the teaching office of the Church is all the more strange because Father Hebert, in his preface, stresses the need of adequate teaching in preparing the way for introducing this service. If the teaching is needed before, surely it is also needed afterwards if the worship is to gain in depth and in relevance to our daily life. "We worship whom we know." To state this omission is to face at once the problem of many parish priests who, though desirous of introducing such a service of worship, yet are conscious that even a sermon now given at a service of Choral Mattins or Sung Eucharist at 11, however inadequate this may be as a method of teaching, is yet impossible and out of place in the short devotional address at the Parish Communion. Is the institution of the Parish Communion, therefore, unless supplemented at another time by systematic teaching, going to result in all that we hope for ?

Professor Vedotov gives an answer to this question in a review on "Liturgy and Society" in *Christendom*, drawn from his experiences in the Russian Church. Referring to the divorce between cultural and social development alongside a return to liturgical worship, he states "that in this problem of the social and cultural implications of Liturgy all depends upon what the worshipper brings with him into liturgical devotion; what is in his mind as he enters the church to participate in the common liturgical worship." Some may feel that this is too strong a statement in view of the doctrine of grace, but experience has shewn that it is quite possible to confuse pietism

and true worship. The one may become an emotional orgy, while the other must express itself in service.

Having stated this problem, may I be allowed to attempt an answer from my own experience covering eight years in a parish which tried to give effect both to the ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments? After a period of preparation, a Parish Eucharist was instituted at 9 o'clock, followed by a Church Tutorial Class in church at 11.30 and teaching for the children and youth at the same time. A similar Church Tutorial Class was also held on a week-day night for Sunday School teachers and others prevented from attending the Sunday class. There is no doubt that such a combination helped to strengthen the worship, the sense of fellowship, and the relevance of both to their expression in Christian witness.

To come now to the other omission. The book would have been strengthened by asking Evangelicals to make their contribution. I still have a vivid memory of being present at the Training College in York at a College Eucharist at 8.30 a.m., followed by an address after the College breakfast at 10.30 a.m. Attendance at the service and the address was voluntary, but over 80 per cent. of the College was present at both. My discussion with some of the men afterwards, among whom were strong Evangelicals, increased my conviction that such a service, supplemented by teaching, might be the means of restoring unity to the Church. Further, I was much impressed by the enthusiasm of the men for this arrangement. "We are beginning to realise," they said, "the meaning of worship and its relation to our life and work here, but what are we going to do when we return to our parishes? Why don't the parishes try out the same arrangement on Sunday morning?"

It is hoped that this book may be the means of provoking much thought and the bringing forth of another book in which these omissions will be rectified, and which will commend a movement of such vital importance to the Church as a whole.

R. E. Parsons.

NOTICES

JOHN DAVIDSON OF PRESTONPANS. By R. Moffat Gillon, Ph.D. James Clarke and Co. 7s. 6d.

The subject of this biography was a fanatical Presbyterian belonging to the left wing of the Scottish Reformers, a master of invective, a man who believed he had a mission to keep James I. in order and never hesitated to denounce in his sermons by name all who were not of his way of thinking. He was the sworn enemy of "Papistrie" and "Prelacy," and in his view whoever questioned true-blue Presbyterianism was guilty of both these crimes. He forgathered with Puritans in England and found himself up against Dr. Bancroft, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who, however, was more than his master. The author of this interesting volume gives a vivid picture not only of this intolerant Presbyterian, but also of the turbulent times in which he lived. He admits the recklessness of his hero, but the well-chosen quotations from contemporary documents shew that extreme Presbyterians of those days were singularly fierce and unattractive men. "One dead," said Davidson on one occasion, "if it were but to execute Mr. Walter Lindsay for his idolatry, would do more good than all the King's letters and the Commissioners both."

Davidson, however, was a man of courage and resource as well as of learning; his zeal unfortunately overlaid his piety. "The Ministers," writes Dr. Gillon, "constituted themselves a kind of moral police, and no one, from the King and Queen down to the humblest subject, was free from their censures" (p. 143).

The story of the Scottish Reformation is a strange and unhappy one, and Dr. Gillon's volume, though written in its defence, makes that fact abundantly clear.

W. PERRY.

CREATIVE MORALITY. By L. A. Reid. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Book after book on moral science assumes a static attitude, and this attitude vexes the soul of Dr. Reid. He is nothing if not dynamic in his attitude to the science he studies so ardently. The conceptions of goodness, duty and beauty may be approached as they appear in the writings of any philosopher you please. They may also be approached as if they were a creative act, the outcome of body, mind and spirit in response to the understanding of the universe. Such is the approach of the author, and in his competent hand it yields not a little illumination to the reader perplexed by the static frame of mind. The stars in his intellectual firmament are H. W. B. Joseph, McTaggart, Prichard, Ross and Webb, but unquestionably the sun is A. E. Taylor. While the whole book is worth reading, it is probable that the last three chapters are those that will linger longest in the thought of the reader. They deal with some religious beliefs and problems, religion and creative morality, and moral integration.

R. H. MURRAY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By F. Bertram Clogg, M.A., B.D. University of London. Price 6s.

My impression is that Mr. Clogg is too kind-hearted; that he has allowed himself to be "put upon" by the Editor or Publishers of the Series or someone, and that the book is written chiefly because the Series needed a book on the subject, and not because Mr. Clogg wanted to write it.

It is just over 300 pages with 27 lines to the page, exclusive of the headline. Mr. Clogg says that "to try in a small volume to estimate the value of many scholars in the wide field of New Testament is no light task." The truth is that it is an impossible task if the author desires to be impartial, and Mr. Clogg should not have allowed himself to be persuaded to undertake it. A book of this size cannot give the theological student what he needs, even if we put our standard as low as the passing of examinations, while what the member of the ordinary public wants is for his author to have weighed the evidence for him and to have come out quite definitely on one side or the other. The schoolboy! —how many schools are there in which the New Testament is studied as a whole? But if the teacher is to be successful he must endeavour to train the pupils' judgment. Of course the book is not sufficiently detailed for the teacher, but neither is it sufficiently stimulating for the pupil; his state of mind after reading it, wherever there is a difference of opinion among authorities, will be that it is six to one and half a dozen to the other, and that it will be time enough for him to bother when experts have made up their minds. The book is honest and careful, and will no doubt help some readers. The pity is that it should have been published with the *imprimatur* of London University, which at least suggests that it is suitable for students, who surely ought to go more deeply into fundamental problems.

F. J. BADCOCK.

THE INCREDIBLE CHURCH. By J. W. Stevenson. James Clarke. 3s. 6d.

The Incredible Church is an excellent book for those who are ready to face its facts, and should be a good tonic for those who flinch at them. For Mr. Stevenson, who was once editor of *The Scots Observer*, knows what people who are outside the Christian Churches think of them; and he knows, not without some bitterness, that their unamiable views are far too often justified. The message of his book, however, is that Christ faced and overcame a worldly Church in His own day, and that the voice of the prophets need never die. His splendid realization that Communism and other idealistic material religions are rapidly dealing with the same situation in a sometimes highly successful manner should wake us all up. *The Incredible Church* is too small and too condensed to be a profound book; but it contains good sayings, a few nasty shocks and some sterling truths.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS OF PACIFISM. By G. MacGregor, D.D., D.Litt. James Clarke. 3s. 6d.

This is probably the best exposition of the case for Pacifism that has yet appeared. It is lucid, scholarly, interesting, and on the whole reasonable. Yet on reading with some care Dr. MacGregor's volume,

I began to wonder whether one could think of Pacifism as a position or only of persons with the temperament of Pacifists. On few subjects has there been of late more discussion and argument, and probably on none has debate been more futile. Professor MacGregor goes through all the relevant passages in the New Testament and without unduly forcing his case presents a strong, though by no means convincing, plea for the pacifist position. The chapter on the Law, the Gospel and the Cross is particularly good. But the intelligent reader will demur to many statements which the author assumes to be axiomatic: "the main aim of war is to kill," "some Christians still think to make Mars respectable by decking him out in a gospel uniform," "such an attitude (Mr. Eden's) would be severely criticized in a private individual." It is difficult to understand Dr. MacGregor's refusal to face the logic and the consequences of his interpretation of the New Testament teaching. No great evil was ever successfully met by argument *in vacuo*. "Hang the consequences" is tantamount to saying "Hang sin"; who would not if he could?

W. PERRY.

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By Nikola Avancini. A new translation by Kenneth Mackenzie, Bishop of Brechin. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The decline of classical education means that "It was Greek to me" is the same as "It was Latin to me," and so it is highly necessary that the great ancient writings should be translated into English, lest they be lost. These seventeenth-century meditations of Avancini's are amazingly attractive and full of devotion. They will be found invaluable for mental prayer at home or in church, but there is another use to which the clergy can put them, namely, to employ their thought as a basis for sermons. One simple quotation will exemplify this. Commenting on John xxi. 9, Avancini writes: "(i.) While they fish, Christ maketh ready their food. Though now endowed with His glorious Body He despiseth not the lowly service. And wilt thou in thy mortal flesh disdain a humble service? (ii.) The Apostles knew not whence were the broiled fishes, the loaves, the ordered repast. Christ would shew that it was His part to provide it all, and that their draught of fishes likewise was a gift from Him. Own God then as the Giver of any good thing thou hast. Render it back to Him, and use it for His glory" (p. 213).

Full of beautiful gems are the pages of this book, and they must help the reader. So many books of meditations tend to be spiritually sugary or theologically high-brow, but this classic of meditation is sane and balanced, and loses nothing thereby in devotional depth. It will bring to the one who prayerfully uses it a new insight into the Gospels without the speculative and romantic nature of modern books on "The Life of Jesus."

Readers of this book will feel very grateful to the Bishop of Brechin for his delightful translation and for the division of the meditations into daily passages, but they ought also to be grateful for the tasteful printing, paper and get-up of this volume. Alas, how few ever say "Thank you" to a publisher or printer!

PATRICK COWLEY.

LATER JUDAISM. By Winifred Lumb. S.P.C.K.

This is quite a useful little manual of 57 pages packed full of information, with a bibliography and a list of suggested essay subjects at the end of each chapter, but it would gain enormously by a small enlargement. The first eight chapters deal with the history from the Exile to the Fall of Jerusalem, and the last two with the literature of the period. Obviously these two divisions cover much the same ground, but there are few cross references from one to the other, and these could be best provided in the form of an index. There is a genealogical tree of the Hasmonæan family, but no corresponding tree for the family of Herod, and it would be a convenience also if a table were given shewing the dates at which the various portions of Palestine, at any rate after the death of Herod the Great, changed hands. These additions are the more necessary because in places the text is somewhat obscure—*e.g.*, under the heading *Herod Antipas* : " When in Rome Herod had met Herodias, wife of Herod, another son of Herod the Great," with no mention of his name—and incidently two consecutive paragraphs should not begin " Palestine, however," " Many of their brethren, however," but such details are after all but minor blemishes.

F. J. BADCOCK.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK. By B. Harvil Branscomb. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Branscomb is a new name to English readers and Duke University, North Carolina, from which he writes, is but little known. Let it be said at once that this new Commentary in the Moffatt series is exceedingly brilliant and must be bought even by those who possess Rawlinson, Swete, Klostermann, etc. Every page can be read with pleasure, though often with disagreement. While he is not an extreme sceptic, he often stretches the case against the tradition as markedly as C. H. Turner did in favour of the tradition in his brilliantly conservative Commentary. For example, discussing ii. 18-20, he says that the answer of Jesus to the question, Why do not Thy disciples fast ? was suppressed and that the answer we have in the Gospel was framed to fit the question why the Church had introduced fasting although the disciples did not fast in the lifetime of Jesus. The Transfiguration story has no basis in fact. Good reasons are given for the view that the Triumphal Entry took place at the Feast of Tabernacles or at the Dedication. There was no " trial " before the Sanhedrin and the account of what took place between the arrest and the condemnation by Pilate is Christian surmise. (But " these things were not done in a corner." Including guards, servants and others, there may have been at least a hundred people present, and it is most improbable that no accurate information was available. Dr. Branscomb accepts the story of Peter's denial but says Peter was downstairs, " below," the authorities being upstairs.)

The lost ending is, with some hesitation, attributed to a trivial accident to the MS., which may be assumed to have been in the custody of some official of the Church of Rome. Commentators are inclined to ignore the difficulty that Clement in the year 96, writing in the name of the Roman Church, either was ignorant that the Gospel existed or knew it but thought it not worth mentioning in a treatise which is largely a mosaic of quotations

from the Bible and of allusions to 1 Corinthians, Romans and Hebrews. Dr. Branscomb's book does good service in reminding us of the many unsolved problems in connection with the Gospel.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Ethiopian Church. By Dr. De Lacy O'Leary. S.P.C.K. 2s.

There are many books on Abyssinia but few deal with the history of the Abyssinian Church. The present work gives a useful account of the Church of Ethiopia from the time of its foundation by Frumentius in the fourth century. Frumentius was consecrated in Alexandria and the Church of Ethiopia continues to receive its Abuna from that see; it has remained subject to the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria up to the present time. This accounts for its separation from the rest of Christendom, for it repudiates the Greek, Latin, and every Church which accepts the decisions of Chalcedon of 451.

The services of the Ethiopian Church are of great interest to liturgiologists. Its liturgy is derived from the Greek liturgy of St. Mark of Alexandria. It is in the Ge'ez language, imperfectly understood by the clergy, who, for the most part, are poorly educated.

In the sixteenth century the Portuguese made a treaty with the King and sent their missionaries to work in the country. Eventually a Uniat Church was formed, which lasted about a century. The movement was not popular and a reaction came with a new king in the seventeenth century, who drove out the Jesuits and proclaimed the dependence of his Church on the Coptic Patriarch. It is to these Portuguese missionaries, notably Alvarez and Bermudez, that we owe most of our knowledge of their Church customs.

There is an interesting account of the reign of Lalibala (1200-1230). In his day at Lasta in Tigré were formed the ten celebrated rock churches which form the most remarkable monuments in Ethiopia; they are of Christian origin and designed for Christian worship. King Lalibala became a national hero, famous for his wisdom and piety, and is now revered as a saint. Of the future of Ethiopia no one can prophesy. Everything depends on the policy of the Italian Government. The whole country is by no means conquered, although the capital has fallen and the Negus is in exile. The treatment meted out to Ethiopia has been cruel and barbarous. Our author says it need not be "an unmixed disaster for the Ethiopian people, least of all for their venerable Church." Many will not agree with this concluding sentence of his book.

The future of the Church depends on the power of the clergy to resist attempts at Latinization which are sure to be made in the future, unless there is absolute religious freedom granted by the Italian Government.

F. N. Heazell.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher